Imprimatur,

Liber cui titulus [A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church, relating to the Eucharist, *&c.*]

Octob. 6. 1687.

H. Maurice, *Reverendissimo in Christo P. D.* Wilhelmo *Archiepiscopo Cant. à Sacris.*

Imprimatur,

Liber cui titulus [A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church, relating to the Eucharist, *&c.*]

Octob. 6. 1687.

H. Maurice, *Reverendissimo in Christo P. D.* Wilhelmo *Archiepiscopo Cant. à Sacris.*

A

FULL VIEW

OF THE

Doctrines and Practices

OF THE

Ancient Church

Relating to the

EUCHARIST.

Wholly different from those of

The Present ROMAN CHURCH,

And inconsistent with the Belief of

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

BEING

A sufficient Confutation of *Consensus Veterum*, *Nubes Testium*, and other *Late Collections* of the *Fathers*, pretending the contrary.

By mr Patrick, afterwards Bp of Ely

Rectum est Index sui & Obliqui.

John Patrick

LONDON,

Printed for **Richard Chiswell** at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

A

PREFACE to the READER.

THAT which is here offered to thy Peruſal, was occaſioned by ſome late Pamphlets *, that appeared, much about the ſame time, in Print, pretending by a Heap of Teſtimonies from the *Fathers* to prove, as in ſome other Doctrines, ſo particularly in that of the *Corporal Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, That the *Ancient Church*, and the *preſent Roman*, are at a good Agreement.

* *Succeſſion of Church and Sacraments.*
Conſenſus Veterum.
Nubes Teſtium.

It is very hard for *Us* to believe this, and ſcarce credible that *they themſelves* did ſo, when we ſee ſo much Unſincerity in their Allegations; ſuch Deceit and contrived diſguiſing the Senſe of the *Fathers*, in their Tranſlations; ſuch late, uncertain, and ſuppoſititious Writings cited by them; under the Venerable Names of *Ancient Authors*: When the way that *Procruſtes* took, of ſtretching Limbs, or chopping them off, to make all agree to his Bed who were to be laid in it, is uſed to make the *Ancient* and the *Preſent Church* to agree, a *Conſent* thus procured can occaſion but a ſhort and a ſorry Triumph.

Yet

Yet thoſe Performances have been cry'd up, and they are look'd upon as *Storehouſes* and *Repoſitories*, whence any Champion of theirs who enters the Liſts, may be furniſh'd from the *Fathers*, either with what is neceſſary for his own Defence, or the aſſailing of an Adverſary. The *Repreſenter*, ſince that, made great uſe of them, in a brisk Attaque he made upon the *Dublin Letter*, tho' the Succeſs, I believe, did not anſwer his Expectation. The *Convert of Putney's* Performance (who in his *Conſenſus Veterum* made the largeſt Shew of Fathers on behalf of Tranſubſtantiation) has had a particular Conſideration given it, by his worthy Anſwerer *: And ſo all the other Teſtimonies in the reſt of them, that are of any ſeeming ſtrength and moment, have received Anſwers to them from other Hands; particularly from the Learned Author of *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation compared, Part* 1.

* *Veteres Vindicati.*

If any thing, after all, ſeems to be wanting on our Part, it is this; That as our Adverſaries have made a *Shew of Fathers* (for I can give it no better name) pretended to countenance their Doctrines of the *Corporal Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*; ſo we alſo ought to have *our Collection of Teſtimonies* from the *Ancients*, made faithfully and impartially, wherein their true Senſe in theſe

theſe Matters may be clearly ſeen and viewed, and thereby their Diſſent from this Church appear plainly, in thoſe things that either *conſtitute* this Doctrine, or are neceſſary *Conſequents* of it. And this is that which I have undertaken in the following Papers; wherein as the Uſefulneſs of the Deſign has encourag'd me to take ſome Pains, ſo I ſhall think them well beſtowed, if the Reader will bring an honeſt and unprejudic'd Mind to the Peruſal of them, and ſuffer himſelf to be determin'd in his Opinions concerning this Controverſie, according to the Evidence of Truth here offered for his Conviction. If the Differences (which the annexed Contents of the Chapters give an Account of) are of ſuch a Nature, and ſtand at ſuch a wide Diſtance, that it's impoſſible ever to bring Tranſubſtantiation to ſhake Hands with them as Friends; and if the two Churches, the *Ancient* and the *Preſent Roman*, are really divided and diſagreeing, as I pretend to have demonſtrated, in thoſe Points, it will then I hope hereafter be ridiculous, to talk confidently of a *Conſent of Fathers*, and of a *Cloud of Witneſſes* on their Side.

But if I am herein miſtaken, I am ſo little tender of my Reputation, compared with Truth, that I heartily deſire to be confuted and made a Convert; for I am conſcious to my

ſelf

ſelf of no falſe Fathers I have cited for true ones; of no diſguiſing or perverting their Senſe, by an Ill Tranſlation of their Words; (which I have therefore ſet down in their own Language) of no impoſing upon the Reader a Senſe of my own making, contrary to what I believe that they intended.

I have but one Requeſt more to make to the unknown Author of a Book intituled, *Reaſon and Authority, &c.* who mentioning the *Defence of the Dublin Letter* * (for which I have ſome reaſon to be concern'd) ſays, That *the Authorities of the Fathers there urged are, as he conceives, in the Senſe of them, either miſtaken or miſapplied, and that he ſhall endeavour to reconcile them to other Expreſſions of the Fathers, and to* (that which he calls) *the Catholick Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.* I humbly deſire, when he is about this *Reconciling Work*, and his Hand is in, that he would go on to reconcile alſo the *Differences* urged in the following Papers. Which if he ſhall do to any purpoſe, I promiſe to return the Complements he has paſs'd upon *that Defender* with Intereſt, and to alter my preſent Opinion of him, upon his Performances in that Book.

* *Pag.* 119.

Farewell.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS.

BEING

A Summary of the DIFFERENCES betwixt the *FAITH* and *PRACTICES* of the *Two Churches.*

CHAP. I. The Firſt Difference. *The Roman Church aſſerts perpetual Miracles in the Euchariſt: The Ancient Church owns none but thoſe of God's Grace, working Changes in us, not in the Subſtance of the Elements.* Page 1

CHAP. II. The Second Difference. *They differ in determining what that Thing is which Chriſt calls* My Body; *which the Ancient Church ſays is Bread, but the Roman Church denies it.* 7

CHAP. III. The Third Difference. *The Roman Church believes, That Accidents ſubſiſt in the Euchariſt without any Subject: This the Fathers deny.* 12

CHAP. IV, The Fourth Difference. *The Roman Church uſes the Word* Species, *to ſignifie thoſe ſelf-ſubſiſting Accidents: the Fathers never take* Species *in this Senſe.* 16

CHAP. V. The Fifth Difference. *The Fathers differ from this Church about the Properties of Bodies; as,*

1. *They aſſert, That every organiz'd Body, even that of Chriſt, is viſible and palpable.* 21
2. *That every Body poſſeſſes a Place, and is commenſurate to it, and cannot be in more Places than one, nor be entire in one Part, nor exiſt after the manner of a Spirit. All which*

Tranſubſtantiation denies. Page 22

3. *That it is impoſſible for one to dwell in himſelf, or partake of ones ſelf; this inferring Penetration of Dimenſions, and that a greater Body may be contained in a leſſer; which the Fathers deny.* 29

CHAP. VI. The Sixth Difference. *The Roman Church teaches us to disbelieve the Report of our Senſes, which tell us, That Bread and Wine remain in the Euchariſt: The Fathers urge this Evidence, even with relation to Chriſt's true Body.* 31

Object. *The Fathers call upon us not to believe our Senſes in the Caſe of the Euchariſt.*

Anſw. 1. *The Fathers appeal to our Senſes in this Caſe.* 39

2. *They call upon Men not to regard their Information, in Matters wherein none queſtion the Truth of their Information.* ibid.

3. *The true Reaſon why the Fathers call us off from liſtning to our Senſes, is, to make us regard and attend to things beyond their Information.* 40

A Place of S. Cyril of Jeruſalem, *and another of S.* Chryſoſtome, *explain'd.* 42

CHAP. VII. The Seventh Difference. *When the Fathers call the Euchariſt Chriſt's Body and Blood, the Roman Church underſtands it of Chriſts Natural Body; but the Fathers mean it commonly of the Bread and Wine. Several Obſervables from the Fathers, to explain and prove this; as,*

1 Obſ. *They tell us of their ſtudiouſly concealing the Myſteries from ſome Perſons.* 44

2 Obſ. *The Fathers, in their manner of ſpeaking concerning Chriſt's Body, point at another thing than his Natural Body.* 46

3 Obſ. *They ſpeak of Chriſt's Body with Terms of Reſtriction and Diminution.* 48

4 Obſ. *They give us Reaſons why it is call'd Chriſt's Body, (which none do for calling things by their Proper Names) from its Reſemblance and Repreſentation.* 49

5 Obſ. *What they call Chriſt's Body, they ſay is without Life or Senſe.* 51

6 Obſ. *They ſpeak of Diviſions and Parts of it, not to be affirmed of his Natural Body.* 52

7 Obſ. *They ſpeak of* making *Chriſt's Body, differently from*

from the Senſe of the Roman Church. 54
They affirm, 1. *That whatſoever is made, was not before it was made.* 55
2. *That* Bread *is made his* Body, *and that it is made of* Bread and Wine 55, 56
They call it ſometimes Myſtical Bread, ſometimes Chriſt's Myſtical Body. 57
8 Obſ. *They ſpeak of Chriſt's Body as ſanctified and ſacrificed in the Euchariſt, which is only true of his Typical Body.* 58
The Natural Body of Chriſt cannot be ſanctified nor ſacrificed properly. 59
CHAP. VIII. The Eighth Difference. *When the Fathers mention a Change and Converſion in the Euchariſt, the Roman Church underſtands ſuch a Change as aboliſhes the Subſtance of Bread and Wine: The Fathers never underſtand it ſo.* 62
Several Aſſertions of the Fathers to explain this.
1 Aſſert. *They diſtinguiſh between the Converſion of a thing, and its abdiſhing.* ibid.
2 Aſſert. *When they ſpeak of a Converſion into what was before, they ſuppoſe an Acceſſion and Augmentation of that into which the Change is made.* 63
3 Aſſert. *The Fathers uſe the ſame Terms of* Converſion, Paſſing into, Becoming another thing, *&c. in other Caſes beſides that of the Euchariſt, wherein all confeſs no Change of Subſtances is made.* 65
Some Axioms of the Fathers to this purpoſe. ibid.
Their Inſtances of ſuch Changes given, in Nature, *in* Regeneration, *in Chriſt's* Incarnation, *our* Reſurrection, *in* Baptiſm, *wherein the Change, however expreſt, can be only in Qualities.* 65, 66, 67
4 Aſſert. *The Fathers, by a Change in the Euchariſt, mean either a Change into a Sacrament, or that of Efficacy and Virtue, by infuſing and adding Grace.* 69, 70
5 Aſſert. *They expreſs as fully, and in the ſame manner, our ſubſtantial Change into Chriſt's Body, as of the Bread into Chriſt's Body.* 72
CHAP. IX. The Ninth Difference. *The Roman Church aſſerts a ſubſtantial Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Body in the Euchariſt, which the Fathers deny.* 74

Several Positions of the Fathers to this purpose.

1 Pos. *The Fathers look upon Christ's Body as absent from Earth since his Ascension; tho' in another sense he is present still.* ibid.

2 Pos. *They distinguish the presence of Christs Body from the Sacrament of it, which they make to be a memorial of him as gone away.* 77, 78

3 Pos. *Whatsoever presence of Christ the Fathers speak of in the Eucharist, they acknowledge the same in Baptism, and as fully.* 79, 80

They speak of those Waters as turned into Blood, of our being Baptized in Blood, and yet neither they, nor any else, dream'd of Transubstantiation. 82

4 Pos. *They so consider the presence of Christs Body in the Eucharist, as can no way agree to his glorified Body.* 83

5 Pos. *According to them, the Presence of Christs Body to us now, is a presence to our Faith, a presence of Union, Efficacy and Grace.* 85

What foul play the Romanists have used with an Author that deny'd this. 90

An Account of a late Learned Dissertation concerning Christs Body and Blood, occasion'd by a doubt proposed to S. Austin. 91

CHAP. X. The Tenth Difference. *The Fathers assert positively, that the substance of Bread and Wine remain after Consecration, which the R. Church denies.* 93

Proved by their asserting, that Christ offered the same oblation with Melchisedek. 101

Fraction in the Eucharist can only agree to the Bread. 103

CHAP. XI. The Eleventh Difference. *The Fathers make the Bread and Wine to be the Sacrament, Sign, Figure, Type, Antitype, Image, &c. of Christs Body and Blood, which Transubstantiation contradicts.* 105

Instances of the particulars. Their calling it a Sacrament. ibid. Signs. 106. Types. 107. Antitypes. ibid. *A* Figure. 108. Image. 110.

Further Remarks of the Fathers confirming the Argument, as

1 Remark. *They say an* Image, Figure, *&c. cannot be the thing it self.* 111

2 Rem. *That an* Image, Type, *&c. must visibly demonstrate*

ſtrate that, of which it is an Image, Type, &c. 112
3 Rem. *They make the Elements to be the Signs, Symbols, &c. of Chriſt as abſent.* 113
Some Paſſages out of the old Liturgy in Bertram's *time.* 114
The Doctrine of the Chriſtians of St. Thomas *in the* East-Indies, *confirming the ſame.* 115
CHAP. XII. The Twelfth Difference. *The Fathers aſſert that Chriſt's Body is not eaten Corporally and Carnally, but only ſpiritually. Whereas the Rom. Church teaches a Corporal Eating of Chriſt's Body.* 116
Berengarius's *Recantation ſuppoſes this in the moſt literal ſenſe.* ibid.
Tho' this ſenſe was oppoſed afterwards. 117. *Yet all Rom. agree that Chriſt's Natural Body is taken into ours.* 118. *How long they aſſert it makes its ſtay there.* ibid. *Horrid Caſes how reſolved.* 119. *What the Fathers call underſtanding things Carnally.* 120. *That they oppoſed the literal and carnal eating of Chriſt's Body.* 121, 122, 123.
Conſiderations proving they did not ſo underſtand it.
1 Conſid. *They ſay we partake of Chriſt's Body in Baptiſm, which can be only ſpiritually.* 125
2 Conſid. *They diſtinguiſh eating Chriſt's true Body from the Sacramental.* 126
3 Conſid. *They aſſert, that the Fathers under the Old Teſt. did eat the ſame ſpiritual meat with us, becauſe they ate it by Faith.* 127
4 Conſid. *They repreſent Chriſt's Body as dead, and that ſo it muſt be taken:* Ergo *ſpiritually.* 128
Two remarkable ſayings of S. Auſtin *to prove all this.* 130
CHAP. XIII. The Thirteenth Difference. *The Fathers aſſert, that the Faithful only eat Chriſt's Body and drink his Blood, not the wicked: the Ro. Church extends it to both.* 131
The Church of Rome *will have not only the wicked but brute Creatures to eat it.* 132
The Cautions of the Maſs ſuppoſe this. ibid.
The Fathers will not allow the wicked to partake of Chriſt's Body. 133
Two remarkable Teſtimonies of St. Auſtin. 136
CHAP. XIV. The Fourteenth Difference. *The different practices and uſages of the two Churches, argue their different opinions*

opinions about the Eucharist. 137
Eight Instances of their differing practices given.
1 Instance. *The Ancient Church excluded Catechumens Penitents, &c. from being present at the Mysteries, enjoining all present to communicate.* ibid.
In the Ro. Ch. any may be Spectators, tho' none receive but the Priest. 139
2 Inst. *The old practice was to give the Communion in both kinds.* 140
Transubstantiation made this practice cease. 141. *New devices for security against profaning Christs Blood.* 142
No reason why the Fathers have not been as cautious in this as the Ro. Church, but their different belief. 143
3 Inst. *The Elevation of the Host that all may adore it, the Roman practice.* 145
This not used in the first Ages at all; when used afterwards, not for Adoration. 145, 146
4. Inst. *The Rom. Church allows not the people to receive the Sacrament with their Hands, but all is put by the Priest into their Mouths, contrary to the Ancient Practice.* 147
5 Inst. *The Anc. Church used Glass Cups for the Wine; which would be criminal now.* 148
6 Inst. *They mixed of old the Consecr. Wine with Ink, which would now be abhorr'd.* 149
7 Inst. *In the Reservation of the Eucharist: Three differences herein consider'd.*
1 Difference. *The Anc. Church took no care to reserve what was not received in the Eucharist: but the Ro. Church reserves all.* 151, *&c.* 2 Differ. *What had been publickly received, the Anc. Church allowed liberty to reserve privately.* 156. *The present Ch. in no case allows such private reservation.* 157. 3. Differ. *They put what was so reserved to such uses of old, as the Ro. Church would think profane.* 157, 158, *&c.*
8 Inst. *The infinite sollicitous caution to prevent accidents in the administration of the Sacrament; their frights and strange expiations when they happen, all unknown, and strangers to the Ancient Church.* 160, &c. *Which is proved positively, from the continued practice of Communicating Infants, till Transubstantiation abolished it.* 165

This

The Contents.

This ſtill a practice in the Eaſtern Churches, that ſubmit not to the Roman Church. 167

CHAP. XV. The Fifteenth Difference. *About their Prayers in two particulars.* 1. *That the old Prayers in the* Canon of the Maſs, *agree not with the Faith of the now Ro. Church.* 168

2. *That their New Prayers to the Sacrament have no Example in the Anc. Church.* 175

CHAP. XVI. The Sixteenth Difference. *That our ancient Saxon Church differ'd from the preſent Rom. Church in the Article of the corporal preſence.* 182, &c.

The Saxon Eaſter-Sermon produc'd as a Teſtimony againſt them. 183, 184, &c.

Two Epiſtles of Elfric *the Abbot, declare againſt that Doctrine.* 187, 188.

A Remarkable Teſtimony alſo of Rabanus *Archbiſhop of* Mentz *alledged.* 189

CHAP. XVII. The Concluſion of the whole. *Shewing, that Heathens and Jews reproached not the Ancient Chriſtians about the Euchariſt.* 191. *Tranſubſtantiation occaſion'd new Calumnies from both.* 194. *The Jew's Converſion ſeems to be hopeleſs, whilſt this is believed by them to be the common Faith of Chriſtians.* 195. *That the Jews have better explained Chriſt's words of Inſtitution; agreed better with the Ancient Church in underſtanding the Sacrament in a figurative ſenſe; and have confuted Tranſubſtantiation by unanſwerable Arguments, proved by Inſtances, from* p. 196. *to the end.*

Faults Eſcaped.

PAge 5. *line* 16. marg. *r.* Serm. 5. *p.* 10. *l.* 7. marg. *r.* τετιμηκεν, *p.* 39. *l.* 11. *r.* ſuppoſes, *p.* 53. *l.* 2. marg. *r.* μεειδε, *p.* 68. *l.* 26. marg. *r.* Serm. 5, *p.* 69. *l.* 10. *r.* thou art wholly changed in the inward Man, Ibid. *l.* 12. marg. *r.* totus in interiore homine mutatus es, *p.* 73. *l.* 6. marg. *r.* qui, *p.* 98. *l.* 5. à fine *r.* ἀμαζόμενον, *p.* 149. *l.* 26. *r.* Paten, *p.* 152. *l.* 10. *r.* Evagrius, *p.* 171. *l.* 23. *r.* that of *Abel.*

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

The First Difference.

The Church of Rome *is forced to assert a continued Series of Miracles to justifie her Doctrine of Transubstantiation. But the Fathers never mention any Miracles in the Eucharist, save only the Effects of God's powerful Grace, working great Changes in us, and advancing the Elements in the use of them thereunto, without changing their Nature and Substance.*

TO give the Reader a View of what Wonders are to be believed, according to what the *Trent Council* has decreed concerning *Transubstantiation*, we need go no further than to the *Trent Catechism* *, which tells us, there are *three most wonderful things, which the Catholick Faith without any doubting, believes and confesses are effected in this Sacrament, by the Words of Consecration.*

* Ad Parochos, part. 2. num. 25.

1. *That the true Body of Christ, that same Body which was born of the Virgin, and sits at the Right-hand of the Father, is conteined in this Sacrament.*

2. *That no Substance of the Elements remains in it, tho' nothing may seem more strange and remote from our Senses.*

3. *What is easily collected from both, That the Accidents, which are seen with our Eyes, or are perceived by our other Senses, are without any Subject* (in which they subsist) *in a strange manner, not to be explained. So that all the Accidents of Bread and Wine may be seen, which yet inhere in no Substance, but subsist by themselves, since the Substance of the Bread and Wine are so changed into the very Body and Blood of our Lord, that the Substance of Bread and Wine cease wholly to be.*

But others of the Romish Writers have made a larger and more particular Enumeration of the Miracles wrought in the Eucharist, which no Created Power can effect, but God's Omnipotency alone. I'le give them in the Words of the Jesuite *Pererius* *, who reckons these Nine distinct Miracles.

* In Joan. c. 6. Disp. 16. num. 48.

1. *The same Christ remaining in Heaven, not departing thence, and without any local mutation, is really and corporally in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

2. *Nor is he thus there only in one consecrated Host, but is together in all Hosts consecrated throughout the whole Earth.*

3. *Tho' the Body of Christ in the Sacrament has all its Quantity and Colour, and other sensible Qualities; yet as it is in the Sacrament, it is neither there* visibly *nor* quantitatively * *as to its* situs, *and extension unto Place.*

* Quantum ad situm, & extensionem ejus ad locum.

4. *Tho' the Body of Christ be in it self greater than a Consecrated Host, yet according to the* (Esse) *Being it has there, it is whole in that Host; nor only whole in the whole consecrated Host, but also whole in every part thereof.*

5. *If those Accidents of the Consecrated Host be corrupted, and it should happen that of them Worms or any other Animal be generated, there is a great Miracle in their Generation: For either the* Materia prima *is created anew, out of which the substantial Form of those Animals is produced, as many Divines now think; or, according to S.* Thomas, *which seems to be a greater Miracle, The Quantity that was of the Consecrated Host, supplies the place of the* Materia prima, *and in it is produced the substantial Form of those Animals which are generated from thence.*

6. *The very Conversion of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which is properly called by Divines* Transubstantiation, *is a great Miracle; for such a Transmutation is found in no other thing, and is besides all the Order and Course of Nature, and can be made by no Created Power, but by God's Omnipotency alone.*

7. *The Manner by which such Transubstantiation is made, is not without a Miracle; for it is made by the Words of Consecration, pronounced rightly, and, as it ought, by a Priest. Therefore, as naturally supposing the last disposition in Matter to produce the Form of Fire, the Form of Fire is infallibly*

bly produced in that Matter: So the Words of Conſecration being pronounced by the Prieſt, Chriſt himſelf is infallibly in that Conſecrated Hoſt.

8. *After Conſecration, the whole Subſtance of Bread and Wine ceaſing to be, yet their Accidents do not ceaſe, but remain: Neither do they remain inhering in any other Subject, but* (per ſe exiſtunt) *exiſt by themſelves, which is truly beſides and above the Nature of Accidents, whoſe* eſſe (as the Schools ſay) *is* ineſſe, *becauſe they can neither be produced nor remain naturally without a Subject.*

9. *Laſtly, Thoſe Accidents of the Conſecrated Hoſt, tho' without the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, yet have the ſame natural Virtue which Bread and Wine had before Conſecration*; viz. *the Virtue of nouriſhing, encreaſing, and ſtrengthning the Body of the Perſon that receives it; when yet Nutrition is made by converſion of the Subſtance of the Food into the Subſtance of the Living Creature.*

By reaſon of which Miracles (he ſays) *the Church ſings thus in the Hymn for* Corpus Chriſti *day.*

Quod non capis, Quod non vides,
Animoſa firmat fides, præter rerum ordinem:
Etſi ſenſus deficit,
Ad firmandum cor ſincerum
Sola fides ſufficit:
Præſtat fides ſupplementum ſenſuum defectui.

That is,

What never yet was underſtood,
Nor ever ſeen by any Creature,
A confident Belief makes good,
Tho' croſs to all the Laws of Nature.

Tho' Senſe will not be brought t'allow it,
A Heart ſincere may be ſecure,
And, waving all its Scruples, ſure,
Since Faith alone's enough to do it;
For Faith ſupplies the Senſes want,
And makes good Meaſure, where that's ſcant.

As for the *Fathers*, they are ſo far from conſenting to this *heap of Miracles* in the Euchariſt, that we have reaſon to think, as to ſome of them, they never entred into their thoughts, nor never troubled themſelves about them; and, for the moſt of them, tho' they are direct Conſequences of Tranſubſtantiation, yet they are oppoſed and contradicted by the *Fathers*, as ſhall be ſhewn in Particulars afterwards: Here it ſhall ſuffice to ſay in general, That the Fathers give us this as a Character of the old Hereticks, to urge God's Omnipotency to countenance and give a colour to their Figments and abſurd Opinions. Thus *Gr. Nazianzen* ſays of the *Apollinarians*, * That *being preſſed with theſe Reaſonings, they fly to this, That to God it is poſſible.* And *Tertullian*, when *Praxeas* alſo urged God's Omnipotency, gives this excellent † Anſwer to him. *If we may ſo abruptly uſe this Sentence,* (*viz.* That to God all things are eaſie) *in our Preſumptions, we may then feign any thing we pleaſe of God; as if he had done a thing, becauſe he was able to do it. But becauſe* (God) *can do all things, we are not to believe he has done that which he has not done; but we are to inquire, whether he has done it or no.*

* Ὑπὸ τούτων ἐξελεγχόμενοι τῶν λογισμῶν, καταφεύγουσιν ἐπί τὸ, Δυνατὸν εἶναι Θεῷ. Orat. 51.

† *Contr. Praxeam*, c. 10. Si tam abruptè in præſumptionibus noſtris hâc ſententiâ utamur, quidvis de Deo confingere poterimus; quaſi fecerit, quia facere potuerit.

Non autem quia omnia poteſt facere, ideo credendum eſt illum feciſſe, etiam quod non fecerit; ſed an fecerit, requirendum.

Thus *Gr. Nyſſen* * aſſerts, *That the Will of God is the Meaſure of his Power.* And *Clemens of Alexandria* †, *That God who is Omnipotent, will effect nothing that is abſurd.* And *Origen* ‖, *When we ſay, That God can do all things, we know how to underſtand* all things, *not of ſuch things as cannot exiſt, and are unintelligible.*

* *Gr. Nyſſen in Hexaemeron.* Μέτρον τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ βούλημα γίνεται.

† *Stromat. l.* 4. *prope finem.* Ἀτοπα γὰρ ἃ συμβαίνει ὁ Παῦλος κεφάτης.

‖ *L.* 3. *contr. Celſ.* Οὐδαμῶν ἀκόων τῶν Παῶν, ὡς δεῖ τὴν δυνατὰ λέγειν, ὡς δεῖ τὴν ἀδυνάτων.

Obj. If any object, That the *Fathers* often bring in Inſtances of Gods miraculous Power (as St. *Ambroſe* does in the *Red Sea* and the River *Jordan*, and in the miraculous Conception of our Saviour, *&c.*) to create Faith in Men as to the great Change that is wrought in the Euchariſt.

Anſ. I.

Anſ. I anſwer, True indeed: But then it is to be remembred, (what ſhall hereafter be more fully declared) that the Change there is not terminated upon the Subſtance of the Elements, nor is God's Power ſhewn upon them, to alter their Nature from what they were before, ſo as to deſtroy them; but it is an addition of Grace to their Nature, and an advancement of them to produce wonderful Effects upon us in the uſe of them. So that now the Element of Water *in Baptiſm* is no more a common thing, but is employed by God to waſh away our Sins, to cleanſe our Souls, and to regenerate and renew us: And in the *Euchariſt* the Bread and Wine, which in themſelves are the Food of our Bodies, are advanced to be a Means to communicate the Body and Blood of Chriſt to us, for the nouriſhing and refreſhing our Souls, and to make us Partakers of the ſaving Effects of his Death and Paſſion; which are only Miracles of God's Grace. And the *Fathers* urge the forementioned Miracles *in Nature*, to aſſure us of theſe Wonders of *Divine Grace*. And this they do not only in the caſe of the *Euchariſt*, but of *Baptiſm* alſo; where yet none aſſert any Converſion of the Subſtance of Water into any other thing. Thus S. *Ambroſe* *: Mary *conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, without the intervention of any Man, as* S. Matthew *tells us*; She was found with Child of the Holy Ghoſt. *If then the Holy Spirit coming upon the Virgin made her to conceive, &c. we need not queſtion but that the ſame Spirit coming upon the Water of Baptiſm, or on him that is baptized, do's produce true Regeneration.* And P. *Leo Mag.* † *Chriſt gave to the Water, what he gave to his Mother; for the Power of the moſt High, and the Overſhadowing of the H. Spirit, which cauſed* Mary *to bring forth our Saviour, the ſame cauſes the Water to regenerate a Believer.* Excepting therefore theſe Wonders of God's Grace, the *Fathers* knew no other Miracles in the Sacraments; and theſe Wonders are common to both the Sacraments, and not peculiar to one of them only.

* *De iis qui initiantur*, c. 9. *ad finem.* Si ergo ſuperveniens Spiritus S. in Virginem, conceptionem operatus eſt, & generationis munus implevit: Non utique dubitandum eſt, quod ſuperveniens in fontem, vel ſuper eum qui baptiſmum conſequitur, veritatem regenerationis operetur.

† *De Nativit. Dom. Ser.* 4. Chriſtus dedit aquæ, quod dedit Matri: Virtus enim Altiſſimi & obumbratio Spiritus S. quæ fecit ut Maria pareret Salvatorem, eadem facit ut regeneret unda credentem.

This,

This even *Card. Cajetan* * was ſo ſenſible of, that he tells us, *We muſt not diſpute concerning God's Power when we treat of Sacraments.* And again, *It is a fooliſh thing to aſſert in this Argument, whatſoever God can do.*

* *In* 3. *part. q.* 75. *art.* 1. Non eſt diſputandum de divina potentia, ubi de Sacramentis tractatur. *Ibid. art.* 2. Stultum eſt ponere in hoc argumento, quicquid Deus poteſt facere.

He was not ignorant of what S. *Auſtin* had ſaid long before †, who ſpeaking of Signs taken to ſignifie other things, and inſtancing in the Bread taken and conſumed in the Sacrament, adds, *But becauſe theſe things are known to men, as being made by men, they may have Honour given them for their relation to Religion; but cannot raiſe Aſtoniſhment, as Miracles or Wonders.* Which he could never have ſaid, if he had believed the Wonders and Miracles of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

† *Lib.* 3. *de Trin. c.* 10. Quia hæc hominibus nota ſunt, quia per homines fiunt, honorem tanquam religioſa poſſunt habere, ſtuporem tanquam mira non poſſunt.

I'le conclude this Head with another Saying of his *, which may be as well applied to the abſurd Paradoxes and Miracles which the *Roman Church* advances in this Caſe of the *Euchariſt*, as ever it was to thoſe he there confutes about *Baptiſm. Theſe are the Prodigies of your Opinions; theſe are the uncouth Myſteries of New Dogma's; theſe are the Paradoxes of Pelagian Hereticks, more wonderful than thoſe of the Stoick Philoſophers.——The things you ſay are Wonderful, the things you ſay are New, the things you ſay are Falſe. We are amazed at your Wonders, we are cautious againſt your Novelties, and we confute your Falſities.*

* *Lib.* 3. *cont. Julian. c.* 3. Hæc ſunt ſententiarum portenta veſtrarum, hæc inopinata myſteria Dogmatum novorum, hæc paradoxa Pelagianorum hæreticorum mirabiliora quàm Stoicorum Philoſophorum —— Mira ſunt quæ dicitis, nova ſunt quæ dicitis, falſa ſunt quæ dicitis. Mira ſtupemus, nova cavemus, falſa convincimus.

But this Difference being more *general*, we go on to more *particular* ones.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Second Difference.

The Church of Rome *differs from the Fathers, in determining what that thing is which Chriſt calls* MY BODY.

THE *Trent Catechiſm* (*a*), tho' it do's not determine what the word [*THIS*] refers to, (only telling us, that it muſt demonſtrate the whole Subſtance of the thing preſent) yet it expreſly denies, that it refers to the *Subſtance of Bread*; for it adds, *If the Subſtance of Bread remained, it ſeems no way poſſible to be ſaid that,* THIS IS MY BODY. So *Bellarmine* confeſſes (*b*), that this Propoſition, *This Bread is my Body*, muſt be taken figuratively, that the Bread is the Body of Chriſt by way of ſignification, or elſe it is plainly abſurd and impoſſible. And he acknowledges (*c*), that this Propoſition, *The Wine is the Lord's Blood*, teaches, that Wine is Blood by ſimilitude and likeneſs. And elſewhere (*d*), *It cannot be a true Propoſition, in which the Subject is ſuppoſed to be Bread, and the Predicate the Body of Chriſt*; *for Bread and Chriſt's Body are* res diverſiſſimæ, *things moſt different.* And a little after, *If we might affirm* diſparata de diſparatis, *different things of one another, you might as well affirm and ſay, that ſomething is nothing, and nothing ſomething*; *that Light is Darkneſs, and Darkneſs Light*; *that Chriſt is Belial, and Belial Chriſt*; *neither do's our Faith oblige us to defend thoſe things that evidently imply a Contradiction.*

(*a*) *Ad Paroch part* 2. *n.* 37. §. *Hæc vero.* Si panis ſubſtantia remaneret, nullo modo dici videretur, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum.*

(*b*) *De Euchar. l.* 1. *c.* 1. *ſec. Nonus.*

(*c*) *Ib. lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. §. *Obſervandum.*

(*d*) *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 19.

So alſo *Vaſquez* (*e*), *If the Pronoun* [THIS] *in Chriſt's Words pointed at the Bread, then we confeſs it would follow, that no Converſion could be made by virtue of theſe Words, becauſe the Bread, of which it is affirmed* (ſc. that it is Chriſt's Body) *ought to remain.*

(*e*) *Diſp.* 180. *cap.* 9. *n.* 91. Si pronomen *Hoc* in illis verbis demonſtraret panem, fatemur etiam tunc, ut nulla converſio virtute illorum fieri poſſit, quia panis, de quo enunciatur, manere debet.

Now that which the preſent *Roman Church* dare not affirm, becauſe if it be taken properly, it is untrue, abſurd,

ſurd, impoſſible, as implying a Contradiction, we ſhall now ſhew that the *Fathers* plainly affirm it, who yet could not be ignorant of this Abſurdity. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that they took the whole words [*THIS IS MY BODY*] figuratively, as the *Proteſtants* do, ſince they cannot be taken otherwiſe, if Bread be affirmed to be Chriſt's Body, as the Romaniſts confeſs. Now that the Fathers affirmed that *Bread is Chriſt's Body*, is certain by theſe following Teſtimonies.

(*f*) *Adv. Hæreſ. l.* 5. *c.* 2. Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ποτήριον αἷμα ἴδιον ὡμολόγησε, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ κτίσεως ἄρτον ἴδιον σῶμα διαβεβαιώσατο.

S. *Irenæus* (*f*). *Our Lord confeſſed the Cup which is of the Creature to be his Blood; and the Bread which is of the Creature, he confirmed it to be his Body.*

(*g*) *Pædag. lib.* 2. *c.* 2. Εὐλογησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, Λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτο μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου· τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον ἠλλεγορεῖ νᾶμα.

Clement of *Alexandria* (*g*). *Our Lord bleſſed the Wine, ſaying, Take, drink, this is my Blood, the Blood of the Grape. For the Holy River of Gladneſs* (ſo he calls the Wine) *do's allegorically ſignifie the Word* (*i. e.* the Blood of the Word) *ſhed for many for the remiſſion of Sins.*

(*h*) *Adv. Judæos, c.* 11. Panem corpus ſuum appellans.

Tertullian (*h*). *Calling Bread his Body.* Speaking of Chriſt.

(*i*) *Idem adv. Marcion. lib.* 3. *cap.* 19. Panem corpus ſuum appellans, ut & hinc eum intelligas corporis ſui figuram pani dediſſe, &c.

And againſt *Marcion* (*i*) he ſays the ſame; *Calling Bread his Body, that thou mayſt know that he gave to Bread the Figure of his Body, &c.*

(*k*) *Lib.* 4. *adverſ. Marc. c.* 40. Acceptum panem & diſtributum Diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, Hoc eſt corpus meum dicendo, id eſt, figura corporis mei.

And in the next Book (*k*). *The Bread that he took and diſtributed to his Diſciples, he made it his Body, ſaying,* This is my Body, *that is, the Figure of my Body.*

(*l*) *Epiſt.* 76. *ad Magnum.* Quando Dominus corpus ſuum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congeſtum, &c.

S. *Cyprian* (*l*), *When our Lord called the Bread, which is made up of many united Grains, his Body, &c.*

(*m*) *Harmon. in Bibl. Patrum,* 1624. *Tom.* 7. Accepto pane, deinde vini calice, corpus eſſe ſuum ac ſanguinem teſtatus, &c.

Tatianus Syrus (*m*). *Chriſt taking the Bread, and after that the Cup of Wine, teſtified that they were his Body and Blood, &c.*

Origen

Origen (n). *That Bread which our Lord confessed to be his Body.*

Eusebius (o). *Christ appointed them* (or delivered to them) *to make use of Bread for a Symbol of his Body.*

Cyril of *Jerusalem* (p). *When Christ affirms, and says of the Bread,* This is my Body, *who will dare to doubt further of it?*

S. *Jerome* (q). *Let us hear, that the Bread which our Lord brake and gave to his Disciples, is the Body of our Saviour.* Which he explains further elsewhere (r), That *as Melchisedek prefiguring him had done, when he offered Bread and Wine, so he also represented the Truth of his Body and Blood.*

(n) *Hom.* 35. *in Matth.* Panis iste quem Dominus corpus suum esse fatetur.

(o) *Demonstr. Evang. lib.* 8. Ἄρτῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι συμβόλῳ τῶν ἰδίου σώματος παρεδίδου.

(p) *Catech. Mystag.* 4. Αὐτοῦ ἀποφηνομένου καὶ εἰπόντος περὶ τῶν ἄρτου, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, τίς τολμήσει ἀμφιβάλλειν λοιπόν;

(q) *Epist. ad Hedibiam.* Nos audiamus panem quem fregit Dominus, deditque discipulis suis, esse corpus Salvatoris, &c.

(r *Comm. in* 26. *Matt.* Quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedek ---- panem & vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis & sanguinis repræsentaret.

S. *Chrysostom* (s). *What is the Bread? The Body of Christ. What do they become that receive it? The Body of Christ. Not many Bodies, but one Body.*

(s) *In* 1 *Cor. Hom.* 24. Τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; Σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Οὐχὶ σώματα πολλὰ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἕν.

S. *Austin* (t.) *What your Faith is to be instructed in, is, That the Bread is the Body of Christ, and the Cup the Blood of Christ.*

And elsewhere (u.) *Our Lord doubted not to affirm, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.*

Gaudentius (x). *When our Lord reached the Consecrated Bread and Wine to his Disciples, he said thus, This is my Body.*

(t) *Serm. ad recens. baptizat. apud Fulgentium, Bedam, &c.* Quod fides vestra postulat instruenda, Panis est corpus Christi, Calix sanguis Christi.

(u) *Contr. Adimantum, c.* 12. Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, *Hoc est corpus meum,* cum daret signum corporis sui.

(x) *In Exod. tract.* 2. Cùm panem consecratum & vinum discipulis suis porrigeret Dominus, sic ait, *Hoc est corpus meum.*

Cyril of *Alexandria* (y). *Christ, when he had broken the Bread, as it is written, distributed it, saying,* This is my Body.

Theophilus Antioch. (z), or the Author under his Name upon the Gospels, speaks just S. *Cyprian's* Language. *When Jesus said,* This is my Body, *he called the Bread his Body, which is made up of many*

(y) *In Joan.* 20. 26, 27. Διαπλάσας τὸν ἄρτον, κατὰ γέγραπται, δεδίδου, λέγων, Τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου, &c.

(z) *Com. in Matth.* 26.

Grains, by which he would represent the People, &c.

Theodoret (*a*). *In the delivery of the Mysteries, he called the Bread his Body, and that which is mixed* (Wine and Water in the Cup). *Blood.*—— And afterwards, *He honoured the visible Symbols with the appellation of his Body and Blood, &c.*

Facundus Hermian. (*b*). *Our Lord himself called the Blessed Bread and Cup which he delivered to the Disciples, his Body and Blood.*

(*a*) *In Dialog.* 1. Ἐν δέ γε τῷ μυστηρίων παραδόσει, σῶμα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρᾶμα. Τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῇ τῶν σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, &c.

(*b*) *In Defens.* 3. *capit. lib.* 9. *c. ult.* Ipse Dominus benedictum panem & calicem quem discipulis tradidit, corpus & sanguinem suum vocavit.

Maxentius (*c*) speaking of the Church, that is called Christ's Body, adds, *Also the Bread which the whole Church partakes of, in memory of the Lord's Passion, is his Body.*

Isidore of *Sevil* (*d*) says, *We call this, by his Command, the Body and Blood of Christ, which being made of the Fruits of the Earth, is sanctified and made a Sacrament, by the invisible Operation of the Spirit of God.*

Bede (*e*). *Christ said to his Disciples,* This is my Body, &c. *because Bread strengthens the Body, and Wine produces Blood in the Flesh; This relates mystically to Christ's Body, and That to his Blood.*

The Seventh General Council at Constantinople (*f*), after reciting the Words of the Institution, *This is my Body,* after his taking, and blessing, and breaking it, adds, *Behold the Image of his Life-giving Body made preciously and honourably.* And afterwards, *It pleased him that the Bread of the Sacrament, being the true Figure of his natural Flesh, should be made a Divine Body, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost upon it, &c.*

Druthmarus (*g*). This is my Body, *that is to say, in a Sacrament*—— *Because among all things that are the Food of Life, Bread and Wine serve to strengthen and refresh our Weaknesses, it is with great Reason that he would in these two things establish the Mystery of his Sacrament. For Wine both chears us and increases Blood, and therefore very fitly the Blood of*

(*c*) *Dialog.* 2. *c.* 13. Sed & panis ille quem universa Ecclesia in memoriam Dominicæ passionis participat, corpus ejus.

(*d*) *Originum lib.* 6. *cap.* 19. Hoc, eo jubente, corpus Christi & sanguinem dicimus, quod dum fit ex fructibus terræ, sanctificatur & fit Sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.

(*e*) *Comm. in Marc.* 14. ——Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem operatur in carne, hic ad corpus Christi mysticè, illud refertur ad sanguinem.

(*f*) *Extat in Conc. Nicen.* 2. *Art.* 6. Ἰδοὺ οὖν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐντίμως, καὶ τετιμημένος πραττομένη. Τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς, διὰ τῆς τῶν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα εὐδόκησε γίνεσθαι.

(*g*) *Comm. in Matth.* 26. *Hoc est corpus meum*; id est, in Sacramento — Quia inter omnes vitæ alimonias cibus panis & vinum valent ad confirmandam & recreandam nostram infirmitatem,

of Chriſt is figured by it; becauſe whatſoever comes to us from him, chears us with true Joy, and increaſeth all Good in us.

recte per hæc duo myſterium ſui Sacramenti confirmare placuit. Vinum namque & lætificat & ſanguinem auget; & idcirco non inconvenienter ſanguis Chriſti per hoc figuratur, quoniam quicquid nobis ab ipſo venit lætificat lætitiâ verâ, & auget omne bonum noſtrum.

Rabanus Maurus (*b*) explaining the Words of Inſtitution, ſays, *Becauſe Bread ſtrengthens the Body, therefore it is fitly called the Body of Chriſt; and Wine, becauſe it produces Blood in our Fleſh, is therefore referred to the Blood of Chriſt.*

(*b*) *Comm. in Matth.* 26. Quia panis confirmat corpus, ideo corpus ille Chriſti congruenter nuncupatur, vinum autem quia ſanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad ſanguinem Chriſti refertur.

In the *Æthiopick* Churches (*i*) they uſe this Phraſe, (which the Church of *Rome* is ſo ſhy of) *This Bread is my Body.*

(*i*) *Ludolphi Æthiop. Hiſt. l.* 3. *c.* 5 *n.* 56. Hic panis eſt corpus meum.

Bertram (*k*). *I am confident, no Chriſtian doubts, but that Bread was made the Body of Chriſt, which he gave to his Diſciples, ſaying,* This is my Body, *&c.* And he there ſhews, that this is made by the ſame change, whereby the Manna and the Water of the Rock in the Wilderneſs were turned into his Body and Blood.

(*k*) *De corp. & Sang. Dom. pag.* 40. *late Eng. & Lat. Tranſlation.* Non putamus ullum fidelium dubitare, panem illum fuiſſe corpus Chriſti effectum, quod Diſcipulis donans dicit, *Hoc eſt corpus meum, &c.*

To conclude this Head; It is plain, that there is a general Conſent of Fathers on the Proteſtant Side in this Particular, *That the Bread and Wine are Chriſt's Body and Blood.* And it is the more remarkable, becauſe they give us this Senſe, when they are explaining Chriſt's Words, and in their Commentaries upon the Goſpels where the Words of Inſtitution are recorded.

CHAP. III.

The Third Difference.

The Church of Rome *believes, That Accidents in the Eucharist ſubſiſt without a Subject; but the Fathers ſay the contrary, That Accidents cannot ſubſiſt without a Subject, and yet never except the Eucharist.*

THe *Catechiſm* of the *Trent Council* * ſays, *That the Accidents which are either ſeen with our Eyes, or perceived by our other Senſes, are without any Subject, by a wonderful manner, and ſuch as cannot be explained.* They grant that we may ſee all the Accidents of Bread and Wine, but *that they inhere in no Subſtance, but ſuſtain themſelves.*——And afterwards † diſcourſe thus: *The Species of Bread and Wine ſubſiſt in this Sacrament, without any Subject in which they are: For ſince the Body and Blood of Chriſt is truly in this Sacrament, ſo that no Subſtance of Bread and Wine remains, becauſe thoſe Accidents cannot be inherent in the Body and Blood of Chriſt, it remains, that the Accidents ſuſtain themſelves, above all Order of Nature, being upheld by nothing elſe beſides. And this* (they ſay) *was the perpetual conſtant Doctrine of the Catholick Church.*

* *Ad Parochos, part.* 2. *de Euchar. n.* 25.

† *Ibid. n.* 44. §. *Tertium reſtat.*

How falſe this Aſſertion is, we ſhall now ſhew from the Teſtimonies of the *Fathers.*

Irenæus (*a*). *We cannot underſtand Water without Moiſture, nor Fire without Heat, nor a Stone without Hardneſs. For theſe are united one to another, one cannot be ſeparated from the other, but muſt always coexiſt.*

(*a*) *Lib.* 2. *c.* 14. Non poteſt intelligi aqua ſine humectatione, neque ignis ſine calore, neque lapis ſine duritia. Unita enim ſunt invicem hæc; alterum ab altero ſeparari non poteſt, ſed ſemper coexiſtere.

Athanaſius (*b*), (or the Author againſt the *Arians* in his Works) aſſerts, That *every Quality is in a Subſtance.*

(*b*) *Orat.* 5. *contra Arianos.* Πᾶσα ποιότης ἐν οὐσίᾳ ἐστί.

Iſidore Peleuſiota (*c*) ſays, That *Quality cannot be without Subſtance.*

(*c*) *Lib.* 2. *Epiſt* 72. Ἡς (οὐσίας) μὴ ὑπαρχούσης, ἀνύπαρκτον ἦν ἡ ποιότης.

Methodius

Methodius (*d*). *Quality cannot be separated, as to its Subsistence, from Matter.* And a little before he says, *This is the most impossible of all things.*

S. *Basil* *. *if by your reasoning you can distinguish Figure from a Body, yet Nature admits no such Difference, but one must be understood in conjunction with the other.*

Greg. Nazianzen (*e*) proves the Holy Ghost not to be a Quality, because then it must be in a Subject. *For*, says he, *either it do's subsist by it self, or is of the same kind with those which are called Accidents, which are in another.*

This would be ill reasoning, if Transubstantiation were true; for the Holy Ghost might be a Quality, and yet be in no Subject, as well as the Colour and Taste of Bread may be in the Eucharist, without Bread or any other Substance in which it is.

Gr. Nyssen (*f*) affirms, *That as that is not a Body to which Colour, and Figure, and Solidness, and Space, and Heaviness, and other Properties are wanting; so*, as he adds, *where those aforesaid do concur, they produce a Bodily Subsistence.*

S. *Austin* (*g*). *It is monstrous, and at the furthest distance from Truth, that what would not be at all unless it were in a Subject, yet should be able to exist when the Subject ceases to be.* This is a Saying with a witness to confute Transubstantiation, where there is the Appearance and Figure, Taste and Weight of Bread, and yet no Substance of Bread is there. Again he says (*h*), *Every thing that is in a Subject, and always remains, it is necessary that the Subject also should always remain.*

Again * elsewhere. *When the Subject is changed, every thing that is in the Subject is necessarily changed.* And again: *That which exists not by it self, if it be forsaken of that by which it exists, undoubtedly will not be at all.*

Also

(*d*) *Apud Photium Codic.* 232. Μὴ δυνάτῳ χωρίζεσθαι καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀπὸ τῆς ὕλης ἡ ποιότης. —— Ἐστὶν ἁπάντων ἀδύνατον.

* *Epist.* 43. Ἀλλὰ κἂν λόγῳ διακρίνῃς τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σώματος, ἡ φύσις οὐ παραδέχεται τὴν διάκρισιν, ἀλλὰ συνημμένως νοεῖται μετ' ἑτέρου τὸ ἕτερον.

(*e*) *Orat.* 37. Ἢ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑφεστηκότων πάντως ὑποθέτεον, ἢ τῶν ἐν ἑτέρῳ θεωρουμένων· ὧν τὸ μὲν οὐσίαν καλοῦσιν —— τὸ δὲ συμβεβηκός.

(*f*) *De Opificio Homin. c.* 24. Ὅπου δ' ἂν συνδράμῃ τὰ εἰρημένα, τὴν σωματικὴν ὑπόστασιν ἀπεργάζεται.

(*g*) *Soliloq. lib.* 2. *c.* 12. Monstruosum enim & à veritate alienissimum est, ut id quod non esset, nisi in ipso (sc. *subjecto*) esset, etiam, cùm ipsum non fuerit, posse esse.

(*h*) *Ibid. cap.* 13. Omne quod in subjecto est, si semper manet, ipsum etiam subjectum maneat semper necesse est.

* *De Immortal. Anim. cap.* 5. Mutato subjecto, omne quod in subjecto est necessariò mutari. *Et cap.* 8. Quod per se non est, si deseratur ab eo per quod est, profectò non erit.

(*i*) *Epiſt.* 57. *ad Dardanum.* Tolle ipſa corpora qualitatibus corporum, non erit ubi ſint, & ideo neceſſe eſt ut non ſint.

(*k*) *In Joan. lib.* 4. *cap.* 1. Ὑπόληψις γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ γιγνωλὼ πως ἂν ὑφιστάναι νοοῖτο, μὴ ἐνυπάρχοντι ἑτέρῳ ὄντων τινί. Πῶς ἂν εἴη αὐτὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ, κἀστὶ καὶ ἡ περὶ συμβεβηκότων τάξιν νοεμένα ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ἐροῦμεν.

(*l*) *Theſaur. aſſert.* 21. Τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγέννητον ὡς ἀχώριστον καταγορεύεται, ὥσπερ ἀεὶ καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς σύμφυτον θερμόν.

(*m*) *Ibid. aſſert.* 16. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀμερίστως ὀφείλει ἡ θερμασία ἀπορέχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς οὐσίας καρπὸς, &c.

Ἀεὶ γὰρ φαίνεται ἡ παιδοποιὰς οὐσίαις τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν πιπτόμενα.

(*n*) *De Trinitate, Dial.* 2. *p.* 451. Τὸ λευκότητα πρὸν ἢ τὸ μελανίαν—— αὐτὰ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰς ἐν ὑπάρχειν ὑπάρχειν διάφορα διαιρέσεις; Οὐδαμῶς.

(*o*) *De Statu Animæ, l.* 3. *c.* 3. In rebus corporeis ſubjectum eſt corpus, & color corporis in ſubjecto: in incorporeis animus & diſciplina, quæ ita ſibi nexa ſunt, ut nec ſine colore corpus, nec ſine diſciplina rationalis ſit animus—— Utrum nam probare valeamus manere quod in ſubjecto eſt, ipſo intereunte ſubjecto?

Alſo in another place (*i*). *Take away Bodies from their Qualities, and there will nothing remain where (thoſe Qualities) ſhould be; and therefore it follows neceſſarily, that they will not be at all.*

Cyril of *Alexandria* (*k*) teaches the ſame copiouſly. He calls it Madneſs to affirm, That the Eſſence of the Son conſiſts in Subjection to the Father. *For*, ſays he, *how can Subjection be conceived to ſubſiſt by it ſelf, without exiſting in any thing elſe?* And afterwards: *If there be no Subject, and nothing præexiſts in which thoſe things are wont to be done, how can they exiſt by themſelves, which are underſtood and defined in the Order of Accidents?*

And elſewhere he ſays (*l*), *To be Unbegetten, is predicated of the Divine Eſſence, as inſeparable from it; juſt as* Colour *is always predicated of every Body.*

And in another place (*m*) diſputing about the Eternity of the Son, and how proceeding from the Father he is not ſeparated from him, he inſtances in Accidents that are inſeparable from their Subjects. *We ſee*, ſays he, *Heat inſeparably proceeding from Fire; but it is the Fruit of the very Eſſence of Fire, proceeding inſeparably from it; as alſo Splendor is the Fruit of Light. For Light cannot ſubſiſt without Splendor, nor Fire without Heat; For what is begetten of them, do's always adhere to ſuch Subſtances.*

Again, in his Dialogues (*n*) of the Trinity, he asks, *Whether Black and White, if they be not in their Subjects, can ſubſiſt of themſelves?* And the Anſwer is, *They cannot.*

Claud. Mamertus (*o*). *In corporeal things, the Body is the Subject, and the Colour of the Body in the Subject: In incorporeal matters, the Soul and Diſcipline are Inſtances; which are ſo connected, that the Body cannot be without Colour, nor the Rational Soul without Diſcipline—— Can we ever prove, that what is in the Subject abides, when the Subject it ſelf periſhes?*

Iſidore

Iſidore Hiſpal. (p). *Quantity, Quality, and Situation, can none of 'em be without a Subject.*

(p) *Originum lib.* 2. *cap.* 26. Quantitas, qualitas, & ſitus, ſine ſubjecto eſſe non poſſunt.

Bertram (q) proves againſt the *Greeks*, That the Holy Ghoſt was not in Jeſus Chriſt as in *his Subject*; becauſe, ſays he, the Holy Ghoſt is not an Accident that cannot ſubſiſt without its Subject.

(q) *Contra Græc. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *in Tom.* 2. *Spicilegii D. Acherii.*

Theſe Teſtimonies of the Fathers may ſuffice to ſhew how they differ from the *Church of Rome*, in this Point, *of Accidents being without a Subject*, which to them is ſo neceſſary a Doctrine, that Tranſubſtantiation cannot be believed without it; and if the Fathers had believed Tranſubſtantiation, it is incredible that they ſhould deny this Doctrine, without ſo much as once excepting the Caſe of the Euchariſt: None can imagine how their Memory and Reflection ſhould be ſo ſhort, eſpecially when (as we have heard) they form their Arguments to prove the Eternity of the Son of God, and the Perſonality of the Holy Ghoſt, from the inſeparability of Accidents from their Subject. Nay, one of them ſays (r), *That if God himſelf had Accidents, they would exiſt in his Subſtance.*

(r) *Orat.* 5. *contra Arianos, inter Athanaſii Opera.*

When therefore P. *Innocent* (s) aſſerts, That in the Euchariſt *there is Colour and Taſte, and Quantity and Quality, and yet nothing coloured or taſteful, nothing of which Quantity or Quality are Affections*: This is plainly to confound the Nature of all things, and to turn Accidents into Subſtances. So that if, for inſtance, the Hoſt ſhould fall into the Mire, and contract Dirt and Filth, this Filth ſticks in nothing, or elſe Accidents are the Subject of it; for it is confeſſed on all hands, That Chriſt's Body cannot be ſoiled or made filthy. Not to inſiſt upon the Nonſenſe of his Aſſertion, which is juſt as if one ſhould talk of an Eclipſe without either Sun or Moon, or of an Horſes Lameneſs without a Leg, concerning which only Lameneſs can be affirmed.

(s) *De Myſt. Miſſæ, l.* 4. *c.* 11. Eſt enim hic color & ſapor & quantitas & qualitas, cùm nihil alterutro ſit coloratum aut ſapidum, quantum aut quale.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Fourth Difference.

The Church of Rome *has brought in the Word* SPECIES, *to ſignifie thoſe* Accidents without any Subject: *But the* Fathers *never take it in this Senſe.*

I Need only refer the Reader, for the firſt part of this Aſſertion, to the Thirteenth Seſſion of the *Council of Trent*, *Canon* 2. *&* 3. where the Word *Species* is ſo uſed: And to what we heard before out of their *Catechiſm*, of *the Species of Bread and Wine ſubſiſting without any Subject in which they are.* Every one knows this is their *Cuſtomary Word*, to expreſs Appearances of things by, when nothing real is under them to ſupport them

But now we ſhall ſee this to be a ſtrange and foreign uſage of this Word, which the *Fathers* know nothing of in *their Senſe*; but in ſtead of denoting Accidents (by the Word *Species*) which are in no Subject, they uſe it commonly for the *Subſtance*, the *Nature*, the *Matter* of a thing, the *Subject* it ſelf that appears: Not for *Appearances without a Subject.*

S. *Ambroſe* often uſes this Word *Species*, but never in the Senſe of the *Romaniſts:* For which take theſe Inſtances.

S. *Ambroſe* ſays (*a*), *That at the Marriage* (of Cana) *our Lord being requeſted, did change the Subſtance of Water into the Species of Wine.* That is, not into the Appearance of Wine, but into real Wine that he changed it.

And in another place*, *He provided for the Marriage a more neceſſary Species: i. e. Wine*, more agreeable to a Marriage-Feaſt than *Water.*

(*a*) *Serm.* 21. Dominum rogarum ad Nuptias aquæ ſubſtantiam in vini ſpeciem commutaſſe.

* *Serm.* 22. Speciem magis neceſſariam Nuptiis præſtitit.

In

In another Book (*b*), ſpeaking of Holy Veſſels which he broke for the Redemption of Captives, he ſays, *This Number and Order of Captives far excels the Species of Cups. i. e.* all ſorts of them.

Again elſewhere (*c*). *The Species of Iron is heavier than the Liquor of Water*: *i. e.* the Subſtance of Iron.

S. *Auſtin* (*d*). *They were all baptized into* Moſes *in the Cloud and in the Sea. If therefore the Figure of the Sea availed ſo much, how much will the* Species of Baptiſm *avail?*

In another place (*e*). *To make the* viſible Species *of Bread, many Grains are mixed together into one.*

Again (*f*), ſpeaking of the Bread in the Sacrament, he ſays, *When by Mens Hands it is brought to that viſible Species* (*i. e.* to the Subſtance of Bread) *it is not ſanctified ſo as to become ſo great a Sacrament, without the inviſible Operation of the Spirit of God.*

So elſewhere (*g*). *They all drank of the ſame ſpiritual Drink; they one thing, and we another; but tho' another as to the viſible Species, yet as to the Spiritual Virtue ſignifying this ſame thing.* Where the *Viſible Species*, it's plain, denotes *Water* to the Jews, and *Wine* to us, not the Accidents only.

And in another Tractate (*h*) to the ſame ſenſe, ſpeaking of the Jews. *Behold the Signs are varied, Faith remaining the ſame. To them the Rock was Chriſt; to us, that which is placed on the Altar is Chriſt: They drank the Water flowing from the Rock, for a great Sacrament of the ſame Chriſt; what we drink, the Faithful know. If you regard the* Viſible Species, *it is another thing; but if the intelligible Signification, they drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink.*

And ſo in another Book (*i*), ſpeaking of things aſſumed to ſignifie matters to us, he ſays, *When it is aſſumed, ſometimes it is ſhewn in an Angel, ſometimes in that* Species *which is not what an Angel*

(*b*) *Officior. lib.* 2. *cap.* 28. Hic numerus captivorum, hic ordo præſtantior eſt quam *ſpecies poculorum.*

(*c*) *De iis qui initiant. cap.* 9. Gravior eſt *ferri ſpecies* quam aquarum liquor.

(*d*) *In Joan. tract.* 11. Omnes in Moyſe baptizati ſunt in nube & in mari Si ergo figura maris tantum valuit, *ſpecies baptiſmi* quantum valebit?

(*e*) *Serm. ad Infantes.* Ut ſit *ſpecies viſibilis* panis, multa grana in unum conſperguntur.

(*f*) *Lib.* 3. *de Trinit. cap.* 4. Quod cùm per manus hominum ad illam *viſibilem ſpeciem* perducitur, non ſanctificatur ut ſit tam magnum Sacramentum, niſi operante inviſibiliter Spiritu Dei, &c.

(*g*) *In Joan. tract.* 26. Omnes eundem ſpiritualem potum biberunt; aliud illi, aliud nos; ſed *ſpecie viſibili* quidem, tamen hoc idem ſignificante virtute ſpirituali.

(*h*) *Tract.* 45. *in Joan.* Videte, fide manente, ſigna variata. Ibi petra Chriſtus, nobis Chriſtus quod in altari Dei ponitur; & illi pro magno Sacramento ejuſdem Chriſti biberunt aquam profluentem de petra, nos quid bibamus norunt fideles: ſi *ſpeciem viſibilem* intendas, aliud eſt, ſi intelligibilem ſignificationem, eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt.

(*i*) *Lib.* 3. *de Trinit. cap.* 10. Cùm autem ſuſcipitur, aliquando in Angelo demonſtratur, aliquando in *ea Specie*

quæ non eſt quod Angelus, quamvis per Angelum diſpoſita miniſtretur.

(k) *In Exod. tract.* 2. Recte etiam vini *ſpecie* tum ſanguis ejus exprimitur, quia cùm ipſe in Evangelio dicit, *Ego ſum Vitis vera*, ſatis declarat ſanguinem ſuum eſſe omne vinum quod in figura paſſionis ejus offertur.

(l) *In Pſal.* 104. Succurrit, non ſolum eis *ſpeciem* frumenti, ſed & vini & olei adminiſtrans.

(m) *Lib.* 2. *Operis Paſchal.*

gel is, tho' it is ordered and diſpoſed by an Angel's Miniſtry. And his next Inſtance of ſuch things is, *ipſum Corpus*, a Body it ſelf.

So *Gaudentius* (k). *Alſo by the Species of Wine his Blood is then rightly expreſſed; for when he ſays in the Goſpel,* I am the true Vine, *he fully declares, That all the Wine that is offered for a Figure of his Paſſion, is his Blood.*

Arnobius jun. (l) *Our Lord ſuccours them, not only by affording them the Species of Corn, but alſo of Wine and Oyl.* Where the Word *Species*, to be ſure, relates to the Subſtance and the thing it ſelf, not to the Accidents of Corn, and Wine, and Oyl.

Sedulius (m) ſpeaking of the Offerings of the Wiſe Men that came to Chriſt, ſays,

Ipſæ etiam ut poſſent Species *oſtendere Chriſtum;*
Aurea naſcenti fuderunt munera Regi,
Thura dedere Deo, Myrrham tribuere Sepulchro.

That is,

They point to Chriſt even by the Gifts they bring;
Gold they preſent unto him as a King,
Incenſe as God, Myrrh for his Burying.

The things they preſent are, you ſee, his *Species.*

(n) *Lib.* 1. *de Gub. Dei, p.* 21. *Edit. Baluz.* Adde medicatas aquas vel datas vel immutatas, *Speciem* ſervantes, *Naturam* relinquentes.

Salvian's words are plain (n). *Add,* ſays he, *thoſe healed Waters either given or changed, which preſerved their* Species, *and relinquiſh'd their* Nature. Here *Species* is taken for the Subſtance remaining, and *Nature* for the Qualities of the Water that were changed.

(o) *De Rebus Eccleſ. cap.* 16. Corporis & ſanguinis ſui Sacramenta panis & vini ſubſtantia Diſcipulis tradidit—Nihil ergo congruentiùs *his Speciebus* ad ſignificandam capitis & membrorum unitatem, potuit inveniri.

Walafridus Strabo (o) ſhewing how Chriſt in the Laſt Supper delivered to his Diſciples *the Sacraments of his Body and Blood in the Subſtance of Bread and Wine*, adds, *Nothing more agreeable than* theſe Species *could be found, to ſignifie the Unity of the Head and Members.* *Rupertus*

Rupertus Abbas (p). *Nothing of the Sacrifice enters into him that has no Faith, besides the* visible Species *of Bread and Wine.* No one ever thought, but that the Wicked partak'd as much of the outward Elements as the Faithful; but he says a little before, That when the Priest distributes the Sacrifice to be eaten by the Faithful, *the Bread and Wine is consumed and passes away.* Therefore by the *visible Species* he means *the Bread and Wine*, which the Wicked only partake of.

(p) *De Offic. lib.* 2. *cap.* 9, In illum in quo fides non est præter *visibiles Species* panis & vini, nihil de Sacrificio pervenit.

It has been largely proved by *Salmasius* (q), That in the *Civil Law* and the *Theodosian Code*, the word *Species* is used for *things* there spoke of; as, *Species annonariæ*, for all sorts of Corn; *Species publicæ*, for Goods brought to the several Ports; *Species vini, frumenti, olei*, for Wine, Corn, and Oyl; and not the Accidents of them.

(q) *Simplicius Verinus de Transubst. p.* 230, *&c.*

It is not to be expected that any thing should be cited out of Greek Authors, whose this Word is not; and yet it is observable, That even among them the Word εἶδος, that answers to the Latin Word *Species*, is taken in the Sense of the *Latin Fathers*, and not in that of the present Church of *Rome*. To give only two Instances.

The Author under the Name of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* (r), speaking of Christ's Incarnation, uses the Phrase of *Assuming our Species*; which his *Scoliast*, *Maximus*, thus explains; εἰδοποιούμενον, that is, *When he had assumed our Species or Nature*; not meerly an Appearance of our Nature.

(r) *Eccles. Hierarch. cap.* 3. Ἐξ ἡμῶν εἰδοποιούμενον.

Τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς εἶδος, ἤγουν τὴν φύσιν λαβόντα.

Theophylact (s). *Because*, says he, *Bread and Wine are things familiar to us, and we could not endure, but should abhor to see Flesh and Blood set before us; therefore Christ, the Lover of Men, condescending to us, preserves the* Species *of Bread and Wine*, (that is, the Elements themselves) *but he changes them into the Virtue of his Flesh and Blood.*

(s) *In Marc.* 14. Τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου φυλάττει, εἰς δύναμιν δὲ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος μεταστοιχειοῖ.

To conclude this Head, *Bertram* (t), following the Sense of the Ancients, uses these Phrases indifferently; *according to the visible Species*, and *according to the visible Creature*, or *according to the Substance of the Creatures.* Which are Modes of

(t) *Lib. de Corp. & Sang. Christi.* Secundùm Speciem visibilem, secundùm visibilem Creaturam, & secundùm creaturarum substantiam.

Speech which the preſent *Roman Church* will not allow of in the Euchariſt: For they tell us their plain Belief, what *Species* are, in a *Sequence* on *Corpus-Chriſti* day, which explains it thus:

Sub diverſis Speciebus,
Signis tantum, & non rebus,
Latent res eximiæ.

Admirable things lie hid under the different *Species, which are only Signs, and not Things.*

CHAP. V.

The Fifth Difference.

The Fathers differ from the Roman Church, in their Aſſertions about the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

EVery one knows what the Sentiments of the *Roman Church* are herein, and what they muſt neceſſarily aſſert believing Tranſubſtantiation: That a Body that is Organical, as Chriſt's is, may be inviſible and impalpable; commenſurate to no Space: That it may poſſeſs one Place, ſo as to be in more at the ſame time: That it may be entire in one Part and in one Point, and may exiſt after the manner of a Spirit.

See *Bellarmine de Euchariſt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *reg.* 3. *& lib.* 3. *c.* 7.

The *Council of Trent* ſays (*a*), *Whole and entire Chriſt is in the Euchariſt, under the Species of Bread, and under every part of the Species of Bread.*

(*a*) *Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 3. Totus Chriſtus & integer ſub ſpecie panis, & ſub qualibet ejus ſpeciei parte exiſtit.

I ſhall now ſhow, That the Fathers aſſert quite contrary to all theſe Maxims of the *Roman Church*, giving us a different Account of the Nature and Properties of Bodies; and in the Particulars forenamed, make no difference betwixt Chriſt's Body and ours.

1 *Aſſertion.*

1 *Assertion.* They assert, That every Organiz'd Body, not excepting the Body of Christ, is visible and palpable.

Tertullian (*b*). *I understand nothing by the Body of a Man, &c. but what is seen and felt.*

Methodius (*c*). *God is Incorporeal, and therefore Invisible.*

Eustathius Antioch. (*d*). *If he was Invisible, without doubt he was Incorporeal.* Speaking of *Samuel* raised at *Endor.*

Didymus (*e*). *If a thing be Invisible, it presently follows, that it is Incorporeal.*

Greg. Nazianzen (*f*). *If God be a Body, what kind of Body, and how?——an impalpable and invisible one?—— This is not the Nature of Bodies.* And he cries out, (Τῆς ἐξουσίας;) *O strange Licence!* to imagine thus.

Greg. Nyssen (*g*) says, *That is not a Body, that wants Colour, Figure, Solidness, Space, Weight, and the rest of its Attributes.*

S. *Austin* (*h*), speaking of our Lord, says, *He is always with us by his Divinity; but if he were not corporally absent from us, we should always carnally see his Body.*

Ephrem Antioch. (*i*). *No Man of any sense can say, That the Nature of that which is palpable and impalpable, of that which is visible and that which is invisible, is the same.* Altho' the *Valentinians* in *Eulogius* (*k*) say, *That the Nature of that which is visible, and that which is invisible, is the same.* And so did the *Manichees.* Ibid.

Vigilius (*l*), speaking of the Lord's Body, says, *It is necessary the Flesh, as well as the Word, if they be of one Nature, be uncreated and invisible—— But it is impossible that Flesh should be the Subject of such Conditions.*

Titus Bostrensis (*m*). *Every thing that falls under our Sight, seeing it is a Body, is in Nature opposite*

(*b*) *De Resurrect. c.* 35. Corpus hominis non aliud intelligam quam — quod videtur, quod tenetur.

(*c*) *Apud Photium Cod.* 234. Ἀσώματος ὤν, διὸ καὶ ἀόρατος.

(*d*) *De Engastrimytho.* Εἰ μὲν ἀόρατος ἦν, ἀναμφιλόγως ἀσώματος ἦν.

(*e*) *Caten. in Joan.* 4. 24. Ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ εὐθέως τῷ ἀοράτῳ τὸ ἀσώματον.

(*f*) *Orat.* 34. Πότερον σῶμα, καὶ πῶς;— τὸ ἀναφὲς καὶ ἀόρατον;— οὐ γὰρ αὐτὴ φύσις σωμάτων.

(*g*) *De Opific. hom. cap.* 24. Οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα, ᾧ τὸ χρῶμα, καὶ τὸ σχῆμα, καὶ ἡ ἀντιτυπία, καὶ ἡ διάστασις, τὸ βάρος, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων οὐ πάρεστιν, &c.

(*h*) *De Verb. Domini, Ser.* 60. Semper quidem Divinitate nobiscum est, sed nisi corporaliter abiret à nobis, semper ejus corpus carnaliter videremus.

(*i*) *Apud Photium, Cod.* 229. Οὐδεὶς ἂν εἰπεῖν δύναται νοῦν ἔχων, ὡς ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ψηλαφητοῦ καὶ ἀψηλαφήτου, καὶ ὁρατοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου.

(*k*) *Ibid. Cod.* 230. Ἡμεῖς τοῦ ὁρατοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου μίαν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν φάμεν.

(*l*) *Lib.* 4. *contr. Eutych.* Necesse erit ut caro, sicut & verbum, si unius cum eo est naturæ, increata sit & invisibilis, &c. Sed carnem his conditionibus subjacere impossibile est.

(*m*) *Contr. Manich. l.* 2. Omne quod sub aspectum cadit, cum

sit corpus, natura oppositum est inaspectabili & incorporeo, &c.

posite to that which is invisible and incorporeal.

Damascen (n). *How can that be a Body, &c, which is impalpable and invisible?*

(n) *De Fide Orth. lib.* 1. *c.* 4. Πῶς σῶμα—ἀναφὲς καὶ ἀόρατον;

Gregory the Great (o), speaking of a glorified Body, says, *It will therefore be a subtile Body, because it will be incorruptible; and it will be palpable, because it shall not lose the Essence of its true Nature.*

(o) *Moral. lib.* 14. *c.* 33. Erit itaque subtilis, quia & incorruptibilis; erit palpabilis, quia non amittet essentiam veracis naturæ.

Cyril of *Alex.* in his Explication of the third *Anathema* of the *Ephesine Council* (p). *He is not a Stranger to that Body which he has united to himself, which we say is capable to be felt, and to be seen.*

(p) *Tom.* 3 *Concil. Labbe. p* 817. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἑνωθὲν αὐτῷ σῶμα, ὃ καὶ ἁπτὸν εἶναι φάμεν, καὶ ὁρατόν.

In fine, The Church of *Rome* makes Christ's Body invisible tho' it be present; the Fathers never make it so, but because it is absent.

So *Ammonius* (q). *He was taken up into Heaven, and became invisible unto Men.*

(q) *Caten. in Joan.* 16. 10. Ἀναληφθέντα εἰς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ ἀφανῆ γεγονότα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

And the *Author imperfecti Operis in Matthæum* (r). *When he is present, he is not believed, but seen; but when he is absent, he is not seen, but believed, whilst he is feared.*

(r) *Homil.* 53. Si sit præsens, non creditur, sed videtur; cùm autem absens fuerit, non videtur, sed creditur, dum timetur.

2 *Assertion.* The *Fathers* assert, That every Body is *quantum*, and as it has Quantity, possesses a Place or Space, and is commensurate to it: That a Body cannot be in more than one Place, nor be intire in one Part, nor exist after the manner of a Spirit. All which are false, if Transubstantiation be true.

S. *Basil* (s) makes that to be *incorporeal*, whose Essence cannot be divided three ways (or has not three Dimensions).

(s) *Contr. Eunom. l.* 2. Οὐσίαν τριχῇ διαστάτην.

Greg. Nyssen (t) says, That if you *take Quantity, Solidness, and other Properties from the Subject, the whole Nature of the Body is dissolved, &c.*

(t) *De Opific. Hom. c.* 24. Ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἰ ὑφαιρεθείη τοῦ ὑποκειμένου, πᾶς ὁ τῶν σώματος συνδιαλύεται λόγος.

S. *Austin* says so much upon this Argument, that I must only mention some few Testimonies out of a great Heap that might be collected.

He says (u), *A Body is that which consists of greater*

(u) *Lib.* 4. *de Orig. Anima, c.* 11. Corpus est quicquid majori-

greater and leſſer Parts, containing greater and leſſer Spaces of Place.

Again (x), diſtinguiſhing Bodies into groſs and ſubtile ones, he ſays, Both are Bodies, *none of which can be every where whole and entire, becauſe by reaſon of its innumerable Parts, it muſt have another Place elſewhere; and how great or little ſoever a Body is, it poſſeſſes a Space of Place, and ſo fills that Place, that it is not whole in any part of it.* And a little after: *God is not thus ſaid to fill the World, in the ſame manner as Water or Air do's, ſo that by a leſſer part of himſelf he fills a leſſer part of the World, and by a greater part a greater.* So that, according to him, none but God and Spirits can have ſuch an Exiſtence.

So in his Epiſtle to *Euodius* (y). *There is no Body ſo little, which after its manner do's not poſſeſs a local Space; neither is it whole every where in that Space it poſſeſſes, but leſs in a part of that Space than in the whole.*

eo quod occupat ubique ſit totum, ſed minus

And again (z). *There can be no Body, either Celeſtial or Terreſtrial, Aereal or Aqueous, that is not leſs in a part than in the whole; nor can it any ways have another part in the place of this part, but muſt have one here, another elſewhere, throughout the ſeveral diſtant and divided Spaces of Place, &c.*

aliud alibi per ſpatia quælibet locorum

But the Nature of the Soul is not found to be extended to the Spaces of Place by any Bulkineſs.

He ſays the ſame in another Epiſtle (a), and adds, *Take away local Extent from Bodies, and they will be no where; and if they are no where, they will not be at all.*

In the ſame Epiſtle, ſpeaking of the Divine Perſons, that nothing hinders why they may not be every where *ſimul*, argues thus:

For

bus & minoribus ſuis partibus, majora & minora ſpatia locorum continentibus, conſtat.

(x) *Epiſt.* 3. *ad Volaſian.* Quorum nullum poteſt eſſe ubique totum, quoniam per innumerabiles partes aliud alibi habeat neceſſe eſt: & quantumcumque ſit corpus ſeu quantulumcunque corpuſculum loci occupet ſpatium, eundemque locum ſic implear, ut in nulla ejus parte ſit totum.—— Non ſic Deus dicitur implere mundum, velut aqua, velut aer, ut minore ſui parte minorem mundi impleat partem, & majore majorem. Novit ubique totus eſſe, & nullo contineri loco.

(y) *Epiſt.* 101. Nullum eſſe quantulumcunque corpuſculum, quod non pro ſuo modo loci occupet ſpatium; nec in ſit in parte quàm in toto.

(z) *Contra Epiſt. Manichæi, cap.* 16. Nec omnino poteſt eſſe aliquod corpus ſive cœleſte, ſive terreſtre, ſive aereum, ſive humidum, quod non minus ſit in parte quàm in toto, neque ullo modo poſſit in loco hujus partis habere aliam partem, ſed aliud hic, diſtantia & dividua, *&c.*

Animæ vero natura nullo modo invenitur locorum ſpatiis aliquâ mole diſtendi.

(a) *Ad Dardanum Epiſt.* 57. Spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nuſquam erunt; & quia nuſquam erunt, nec erunt.

Non enim corpora ſunt, quorum amplior ſit in tribus quam in ſingulis magnitudo, nec loca ſuis molibus tenent, ut diſtantibus ſpatiis ſimul eſſe non poſſint.

Ubique totum præſentem eſſe non dubites tanquam Deum, & in eodem Templo Dei eſſe tanquam inhabitantem Deum, & in loco aliquo cœli, propter veri corporis modum.

(b) *De Civit. Dei, l.* 22. *c.*29. Deus totus in cœlo eſt, totus in terra, non alternis temporibus ſed utrumque ſimul, quod nulla natura corporalis poteſt.

(c) *Epiſt.*6. *ad Italicam.* Omne quod oculis corporeis conſpici poteſt, in loco aliquo ſit neceſſe eſt, neque ubique ſit totum, ſed minore ſui parte minorem locum occupet, & majore majorem.

(d) *Cont. Epiſt. Manichæi, c.*16. Aeris partes ſuos quoque implent locos, nec fieri poteſt ut aer quo impletur hæc domus, ſimul ſecum in eadem domo habere poſſit etiam illum aerem quem vicini habent.

(e) *De Immort. Animæ, c.* 16. Moles omnis quæ occupat locum, non eſt in ſingulis ſuis partibus tota, ſed in omnibus, quare aliqua pars ejus alibi eſt, & alibi alia.

(f) *Tract.* 31. *in Joan.* Homo ſecundùm corpus in loco eſt, & de loco migrat, & cum ad alium locum venerit, in eo loco unde venit non eſt: Deus autem implet omnia & ubique totus eſt, non ſecundùm ſpatia tenetur locis. Erat tamen Chriſtus ſecundùm viſibilem carnem in terra, ſecundùm inviſibilem Majeſtatem in cœlo & in terra.

For they are not Bodies, whoſe Magnitude is larger in Three than in One; nor do they poſſeſs Places by their Bulk, ſo as not to be able to be in diſtant Spaces at once, (which is the Nature, he acknowledges, of Bodies).

He ſays alſo of Chriſt, *We are not to doubt that whole Chriſt is every where preſent as God, and is in the ſame Temple of God, as an inhabiting Deity, and in one certain place of Heaven, by reaſon of the Nature of his true Body.*

Elſewhere (*b*). *God is whole in Heaven, and whole on Earth; not at different times ſucceſſively, but both together; which no Corporeal Nature is capable of.*

Again (*c*). *Every thing that may be ſeen with Bodily Eyes, muſt of neceſſity be in ſome Place; nor can it be whole every where, but muſt poſſeſs a leſſer Place by a leſſer Part of it ſelf, and a greater Place by a greater Part.*

He repeats almoſt the ſame, in his Twenty eighth Epiſtle.

And in another Book (*d*). *The Parts of Air alſo fill their Places; nor is it poſſible that the Air that fills this Houſe, ſhould together with it have the Air that is in a Neighbour's Houſe.*

Again elſewhere (*e*). *Every thing of Bulk that poſſeſſes a Place, is not whole in its ſingle Parts, but whole in all its Parts; therefore one Part of it is in this Place, and another in another.*

In another Tract (*f*). *Man, as to his Body, is in a Place, and paſſes from one Place to another; and when he comes to another Place, he is no longer in that Place from whence he came. But God fills all things, and is every where whole, not confined to Places according to Spaces. Chriſt, according to his viſible Fleſh, was on Earth; according to his inviſible Majeſty, in Heaven and Earth.*

To

To name but two or three more out of S. *Auſtin*, who ſeems to ſpeak Prophetically (*g*). *Having ſaid thus, he aſcended into Heaven, and would precaution us againſt thoſe that he foretold would ariſe in ſucceeding Ages, and ſay*, Lo here is Chriſt, or lo there; *whom he warned us not to believe: And we ſhall have no Excuſe if we ſhall believe them againſt this ſo clear, open, and manifeſt Voice of our Paſtor, &c.*

(*g*) *De Unit. Eccleſ. c.* 10. His dictis mox aſcendit in cœlum, præmunire voluit aures noſtras adverſus eos, qui procedentibus temporibus exſurrecturos eſſe prædixerat, & dicturos, *Ecce hic Chriſtus, ecce illic.* Quibus nec crederemus admonuit. Nec ulla nobis excuſatio eſt, ſi crediderimus contra vocem Paſtoris noſtri tam claram, tam apertam, tam manifeſtam, *&c.*

And in his Book againſt *Fauſtus* (*h*), he ſays, That Chriſt, *according to his Corporal Preſence, cannot be at the ſame time in the Sun, and in the Moon, and on the Croſs.*

(*h*) *Lib.* 20. *cap.* 11. Secundùm præſentiam corporalem ſimul & in Sole, & in Luna, & in Cruce eſſe non poſſet.

Laſtly, in another Tract (*i*). *Our Lord is above, yet alſo Truth the Lord is here: For the Body of our Lord in which he aroſe, muſt be in one Place; his Truth is diffuſed every where.*

(*i*) *Tract.* 30. *in Joan.* Surſum eſt Dominus, ſed etiam hic eſt veritas Dominus. Corpus enim Domini in quo reſurrexit uno loco eſſe oportet (*the Printed Copies abſurdly read* poteſt) veritas ejus ubique diffuſa eſt.

Neither do the reſt of the *Fathers* differ from his Doctrine, but give their full Conſent to it.

Anaſtaſius Nicænus (*k*). *It is impoſſible to imagine a Body without a Place, and other things without which it cannot be, &c.*

(*k*) *In Collect. adv. Severianos in Bibl. Patr. Tom.* 4. Impoſſibile eſt cogitare corpus ſine loco, & ſine aliis extra quæ eſſe non poteſt, *&c.*

Didymus Alexandr. (*l*) proves the Holy Ghoſt to be God, becauſe he is in more Places than one. *The Holy Ghoſt himſelf, if he were one of the Creatures, would at leaſt have a circumſcribed* (or bounded) *Subſtance, as all things have that are made—— But the Holy Spirit, ſeeing he is in more than one, has not a bounded Subſtance.* And afterwards he ſays, That the Holy Ghoſt was preſent with the Apoſtles, tho' diſperſed to the ends of the Earth; and adds, *The Power of Angels is altogether a Stranger to this.*

(*l*) *De Spiritu S. lib.* 1. Ipſe Spiritus S. ſi unus de creaturis eſſet, ſaltem circumſcriptam haberet ſubſtantiam, ſicut univerſæ quæ factæ ſunt — Spiritus autem, cùm in pluribus ſit, non habet ſubſtantiam circumſcriptam.

Angelica virtus ab hoc prorſus aliena.

Theodoret (*m*) makes this a Conſequence from Angels being of a determinate Subſtance, *That then they require a Place to be in: For only the Divinity,*

(*m*) *In Geneſ. qu.* 3. Τότε ἀρχ περιγράφου· μόνον γὰρ τὸ Θεῖον, ὡς ἀπερίγραπτον οὐκ ἐν τόπῳ.

vinity, says he, *as being undetermined, is not in a Place.* And elsewhere (*n*), speaking of Christ's Body after the Resurrection, he says, *Still it is a Body, having its former Circumscription.*

Cyril of Alexandria (*o*), disputing against those that thought the *Son* was begotten of the Substance of the *Father*, by a division of his Substance, says, *If the Divine Nature did admit of Section and Division, then you conceive of it as a Body; and if so, then it must be in a Place, and in Magnitude and Quantity; and if endued with Quantity, it could not avoid being circumscribed.*

Fulgentius (*p*) also. *That which is circumscribed by any End* (or Bound), *must be contained in a Place, or in Time.*

And again (*q*), speaking of Christ's Body: *If the Body of Christ be a true one, it must be contained in a Place.*

S. *Greg. Nazianzen* (*r*) makes it *impossible for one Body to be in divers.*

So do's *Damascen* (*s*) make it impossible that one Body should pass thro' another, unless there be τέμνον καὶ τεμνόμενον, *that which divides, and that which is divided.*

Claud. Mamertus (*t*). *Nothing illocal is corporeal: every thing illocal is also incorporeal.*

And again (*u*). *It is plain, that no Body can be touched wholly together, nor can the least Whole you can imagine, be in one Place,* (that is, in one Point.) And he instances in a Grain of Poppy, or the least part of it, *That it has not its lower Parts there where it has its upper Parts, nor its right-hand Parts there where its left-hand Parts are, nor its Parts before there where it has its Parts behind.*

S. *Hilary* (*x*) speaking of Christ as God, says, *He is a Spirit penetrating and containing all things. For according to us he is not corporeal, so that when he is present in one Place, he should be absent from another, &c.*

(*n*) *Dialog.* 2. Σῶμα δὲ ὅμως ἐστὶ, τὴν προτέραν ἔχων περιγραφήν.

(*o*) *De S. Trinit. Dial.* 2.

Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ πάντως ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐν μεγέθει, καὶ ποσῷ, καὶ ἐπειδὴ πεπόσωται, μὴ φυγέτω περιγραφήν.

(*p*) *Ad Trasimund. lib.* 2. *c.* 7. Quod aliquo circumscribitur fine, necesse est ut loco teneatur aut tempore.

(*q*) *Ib. c.* 18. Si verum est corpus Christi, loco utique oportet contineri. (*The printed Copies read* potest contineri, *without Sense.*)

(*r*) Σῶμα ἐν σώμασιν ἐστὶ, ὅπερ ἀδύνατον. *Orat.* 34.

(*s*) *De Fide Orth. l.* 1. *c.* 4.

(*t*) *De Statu Animæ, l.* 2. *c.* 3. Nihil illocale corporeum: omne illocale incorporeum quoque est

(*u*) *Ibid. lib.* 1. *c.* 18. Hinc patet omne corpus totum simul tangi non posse, nec in uno loco esse quamlibet minimum totum posse. —— Illic non habet inferiora sua ubi habet superiora sua, nec illic dextra ubi sinistra, nec anteriora illic ubi posteriora.

(*x*) *In Psal.* 124. Spiritus namque est omnia penetrans & continens. Non enim secundùm nos corporalis est, ut cùm alicubi adsit, absit aliunde, *&c.*

And

And elsewhere (*y*). *A Man, or any thing like him, when he is in a Place any where, cannot then be elsewhere; because that which is there, is contained where it is; and he that is placed any where, his Nature is uncapable to be every where.*

So also *Nazianzen* (*z*). *A Vessel of the capacity of one Measure, will not contain two Measures; nor the Place that will hold one Body, can receive two or more Bodies into it.*

Again (*a*) a little after. *This is the Nature of Intellectual Beings, that incorporeally and indivisibly they mingle with one another, and with Bodies.*

And elsewhere (*b*) he proves the Deity of the Holy Ghost, because *he penetrates all intellectual, pure, and most subtile Spirits* (as the Angels, and also Apostles and Prophets) *at the same time, when they are not in the same places, but dispersed severally; which shews, that the Holy Spirit is uncircumscribed.*

S. *Basil* uses the same Argument (*c*) to prove the same. *Every one of the other Powers we believe to be in a circumscribed Place; for the Angel that was present to* Cornelius, *was not in the same place that he was in when he was present to* Philip; *nor the Angel that talked with* Zacharias *at the Atar, did at the same time fulfil his Station in Heaven. But the Spirit, we believe, could at the same time act both in* Abaccuk, *and in* Daniel *when he was in* Babylon, *&c. For the Spirit of the Lord filled the Universe.* Which is an ill Argument, if Christ's Body could be in more Places at the same time.

Arnobius (*d*) disputing against the Heathens, who said that their Gods did inhabit their Statues, whom yet they believed to be finite and bounded, urges them thus. *The Gods that inhabit in Statues, are they single Gods that are in single Statues whole, or divided into several parts? For one God* (finite as theirs were) *cannot be in many Statues at the same time, nor again exist divided into Parts, by being cut asunder. For let us suppose*

(*y*) *Lib.* 8. *de Trinitate.* Homo, aut aliquid ei simile, cùm alicubi erit, tum alibi non erit; quia illud quod est illic continetur ubi fuerit, infirma ad id natura ejus, ut ubique sit, qui insistens alicubi sit.

(*z*) *Orat.* 51. Ἀγγεῖον μεδιμναῖον οὐ χωρήσει δεμέδιμνον, οὐδὲ σώματος ἑνὸς τόπος δύο ἢ πλείω σώματα.

(*a*) *Paulo post.* Τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τῶν νοητῶν φύσις, ἀσωμάτως καὶ ἀχωρίστως, καὶ ἀλλήλοις, καὶ σώμασι μίγνυσθαι.

(*b*) *Orat.* 37. Διὰ πάντων χωρῶν πνευμάτων νοερῶν, καθαρῶν, λεπτοτάτων — κατὰ ταυτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τόποις, ἄλλων δὲ ἀλλαχοῦ νενεμημένων, ᾧ δηλοῦται τὸ ἀπερίγραπτον.

(*c*) *De Spir. S. cap.* 14. Ἄλλων ἑκάστη δυνάμεων ἐν περιγραπτῷ τόπῳ τυγχάνειν πεπίστευται, &c.

Πνεῦμα γὰρ Κυρίου πεπλήρωκε τὴν οἰκουμένην.

(*d*) *Lib.* 6. *contra Gentes.* In simulachris Dii habitant, singuline in singulis toti, an partiliter atque in membra divisi? Nam neque unus Deus in compluribus potis est uno tempore inesse simulachris, neque rursus in partes sectione interveniente divisus. Constituamus enim decem millia simulachrorum to-

to esse in orbe *Vulcani*: nunquid esse ut dixi, decem omnibus in millibus poris est unus uno in tempore? Non opinor. Qua causa? Quia quæ sunt privata singulariaque naturâ multa fieri nequeunt, simplicitatis suæ integritate servata — Si hoc fuerit sumptum, posse unum in omnibus eodem tempore permanere, aut Deorum unusquisque dicendus ita ipsum semet ab ipso se dividere, ut & ipse sit & alter, non aliquo discrimine separatus, sed & ipse idem & alius; quod quoniam recusat & respuit aspernaturque natura, aut innumeros dicendum est confitendumq; esse *Vulcanos*, si in cunctis volumus eum degere atque inesse simulachris, aut erit in nullo, quia esse divisus natura prohibetur in plurimis.

(e) *Lib. de Spir. S. c.* 7. Cùm omnis creatura certis suæ naturæ sit circumscripta limitibus, &c. quomodo quis audeat creaturam appellare Spiritum S. qui non habeat circumscriptam determinatamq; virtutem? quia & in omnibus & ubique semper est, quod utique Divinitatis & Dominationis est proprium.

—— De quo hoc Angelo Scriptura dicit? de qua Dominatione? de qua Potestate? Cujus invenimus Angeli virtutem per plurimos esse diffusam?— Quis ergo dubitet quin divinum sit, quod infunditur simul pluribus nec videtur; corporeum autem quod videtur a singulis & tenetur?

(f) *Lib. de Trinitate.* Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo adest ubique invocaturis? cùm hæc non hominis natura est sed Dei, ut adesse in omni loco possit.

that there are ten thousand Statues of Vulcan *all the World over: can one at one time be in all those ten thousand Statues? I think not. If you ask, Why so? Even because those things that are of a particular and singular Nature, cannot be made many, retaining the entireness of their simplicity.* Again: ——*If this be supposed, that one Deity can dwell in them all at one time, then you must either say of every God, that he can divide himself from himself, so as to be the same, and another too, not separated by any difference, but that he shall be the very same, and yet another; which because Nature refuses and rejects, you must say and confess, That there are innumerable* Vulcans, *if we will suppose him to be and to dwell in all his Statues; or else that he is in none of them, because Nature prohibits his division among many.* All this would be very ill Reasoning, if he believed that which the *Church of Rome* does, That all this which he disputes against, is done in the Eucharist.

S. *Ambrose* (e). *Since every Creature is bounded within certain Limits of its Nature, &c. how dare any one call the Holy Ghost a Creature, who has not a limited and determined Virtue? For he is always in all things, and in all places, which is the Property of the Divinity, and of Supreme Rule.*

And afterwards mentioning that place of the Psalmist, *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?* he adds, *Of what Angel do's the Scripture say thus? of what Principality? of what Power? What Angel's Virtue do we find diffused among many?—— Who can doubt then that to be Divine, that is at once infused into more, and is not seen; and that to be Corporeal, which is seen of every one, and held by them?*

Nestorian (f) also proves the Deity of Christ, by his Presence in every place. *If Christ be only Man, how is he every where present with those that call upon him? seeing this is not the Nature of Man, but of God, to be present in every place.*

Author

Author Quæst. ad Antioch. (g) denies that Angels can be present in many places at once, and adds, *That it's God's Property only to be found in two places, and in the whole World at the same moment of time.*

(g) *Quæst.* 26. Μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὸν ἐν δυσὶ τόποις, καὶ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ῥοπῇ εὑρίσκεσθαι.

In consequence of this Doctrine of theirs about Bodies, the Fathers in the last place assert,

3 *Assertion.* That it is impossible for one to dwell in himself, or to partake of, and have ones own Body in himself; because whatsoever contains, must be greater than that which is contained in it; and there would be a Penetration of Dimensions, which they deny.

Cyril of Alex. (h) lays it down as a Rule, that *Nothing can partake of it self.*

(h) *De Trin. Dialog.* 6. Μέτοχον ἑαυτοῦ παντελῶς οὐδέν.

And elsewhere (i). *Seeing nothing can partake of it self, but this is with relation to another, it is altogether necessary to affirm, That that which partakes should be different in nature from that which is partaked of.*

(i) *Ibid. Dial.* 5. & 7. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἑαυτοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἄν τι μεταλάχοι ποτὲ, πάθοι δ' ἂν αὐτὸ τῇ πρὸς ἕτερον σχέσει, τὸ μέτοχον τοῦ μετεχομένου, πᾶσα πῶς ἀνάγκη καὶ ἑτεροφυὲς εἶναι λέγειν.

And again (k) he says, *That to partake of ones self, is absurd so much as to imagine it.*

(k) *Idem in Joan. lib.* 2. *c.* 1. Μόνον ἐννοεῖν ἀπίθανον.

S. *Chrysostom* (l) says, *He that dwells in the Tabernacle, and the Tabernacle it self, are not the same; but one thing dwells in another thing; for nothing dwells in it self.*

(l) *Hom.* 10. *in Joan. citat. à Theodoret. Dial.* 2. Ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ σκηνοῖ —— οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατοικεῖ.

Gelasius Cæsarien. (m). *The Word was made Flesh, not being it self changed, but dwelling in us. The Tabernacle is one thing, and the Word is another; the Temple is one thing, and God that dwells in it another.*

(m) *Citat. à Theodoret. Dial.* 1. Ἐν ἡμῖν σκηνώσας· ἕτερον σκηνὴ, καὶ ἕτερον ὁ λόγος; ἕτερον ὁ ναὸς, καὶ ἕτερον ὁ ἐνοικῶν αὐτῷ Θεός.

See also the like Saying in *Methodius*, cited by *Photius* his *Bibliotheca. Cod.* 234. *pag.* 920. *ult. Edit.*

In a word, the Fathers oppose all Penetration of Dimensions in Bodies, and say (n), That *it is impossible for one Body to penetrate another Body.*

(n) *Author. Libr. cui tit. Celebres Opiniones de Anima, c.* 10. Σῶμα γὰρ διὰ σώματος χωρῆσαι ἀδύνατον.

And

(o) *Ibid. cap. ult.* Sic dici poſſet in milii grano cœlum contineri.

And the ſame Author ſays (o), That if this were poſſible, *you might then ſay, That Heaven it ſelf might be contained in a Grain of Millet.*

The Fathers argue againſt *Marcion*, upon this Rule, That *whatſoever contains another thing, is greater than that which is contained in it.*

(p) *Hæreſ.* 42. *ſec.* 7. Τὸ ἀπεριεχτικὸν μεῖζον τοῦ ἀπεριχωρήτου.
(q) *Contr. Marcion. l.* 1. *c.* 15.
(r) *Adv. Hær. l.* 2. *c.* 1.
(s) *De Vita Moſis.*

So do's *Epiphanius* (p). So do's *Tertullian* (q). *Irenæus* (r) has the ſame Rule, and laughs at *Marcion's* God upon that account.

Greg. Nyſſen (s) proves that the Deity has no Bounds, by this Argument, *That otherwiſe what contains would be greater than the Deity contained therein.*

(t) *Ad Autolycum, l.* 2. Μεῖζον γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ χωροῦν τοῦ χωρουμένου.

Theophylus Antioch. (t) ſays, *This is the Property of the Almighty and True God, not only to be every where, but to inſpect and hear all things. Neither is he contained in a Place, for elſe the containing Place would be greater than himſelf; for that which contains, is greater than that which is contained in it.*

(u) *De Fide ad Petr. c.* 3. Unaquæque res ita permanet, ſicut à Deo accepit ut eſſet, alia quidem ſic, alia autem ſic. Neque enim ſic datum eſt corporibus ut ſint, ſicut ſpiritus acceperunt, *&c.*

I will conclude this Chapter with the remarkable Words of *Fulgentius* (u). *Every thing ſo remains, as it has received of God that it ſhould be, one on this manner, and another on that. For it is not given to Bodies to exiſt after ſuch a manner as is granted unto Spirits, &c.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The Sixth Difference.

The Church of Rome *(ſuitably to the ſtrange Doctrine it teaches about Chriſt's Body and Blood) teaches us not to believe the Report our Senſes make, That the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remain in the Sacrament; but to paſs a contrary Judgment to what they inform us herein. But the Fathers teach the contrary, That we may ſecurely relie upon the Evidence of our Senſes, as to any Body, even as to the true Body of Chriſt.*

THat the *Church of Rome* would not have us in this Matter to attend to the Evidence of Senſe, is needleſs to prove, ſince nothing is more common than to hear them call upon us to diſtruſt them, and to believe againſt their Report. Thus the *Trent Catechiſm* * teaches us to believe, *That no Subſtance of the Elements remains in the Euchariſt, tho' nothing ſeems more ſtrange and remote from our Senſes than this.* And again †, *We ſo receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that yet we cannot perceive by our Senſes that it is truly ſo.*

* *Ad Paroch. de Euchar. part.* 2. *num.* 25. ——Nullam Elementorum ſubſtantiam remanere, quamvis nihil magis à ſenſibus alienum & remotum videri poſſit.

† *Ib. n.* 46. Corpus & ſanguinem Domini ita ſumimus, ut tamen quod verè ſit, ſenſibus percipi non poteſt.

As for the *Fathers*, they are Strangers to this Doctrine, nor did they betray the Chriſtian Cauſe in this manner, by taking away all Certainty from the Teſtimony of our Senſes. They, on the contrary, proved the Truth of Chriſt's Body againſt the *Valentinians*, the *Marcionites*, and other Hereticks, by this Argument, which the Church of *Rome* rejects; they made their Appeals frequently (as S. *John* had done before them) to what had been ſeen with Mens Eyes, to what their Ears had heard, and their Hands had handled, without any ſuſpicion of their being deceived.

Thus *Irenæus* (*a*). *This meets with them who ſay, That Chriſt ſuffered only ſeemingly. For if he did not truly ſuffer, no Thanks are due to him, when there was no Paſſion. And when he ſhall begin truly to ſuffer, he will ſeem a Seducer, when he exhorts*

(*a*) *Lib.* 3. *adv. Hæreſ. c.* 20. Hoc autem & illis occurrit, qui dicunt eum putativè paſſum: Si enim non verè paſſus eſt, nulla gratia ei, cùm nulla fuerit paſſio. Et nos cùm incipiemus

verè pati, ſeducens videbitur, adhortans nos vapulare & alteram præbere maxillam, ſi ipſe illud non prior in veritate paſſus eſt. Et quemadmodum illos ſeduxit, ut videretur ipſe hoc quod non erat, & nos ſeducit adhortans perferre ea quæ ipſe non pertulit.

exhorts us to ſuffer Stripes, and to turn the other Cheek, if he firſt did not ſuffer this in truth. And as he ſeduced them, in ſeeming to be that which he was not; ſo he ſeduces us, whilſt he exhorts us to ſuffer the things which he did not ſuffer.

(b) *Id. lib. 5. cap. 1. citante Theodoreto, Dial. 2.* Οὐ γὰρ δοκήσει πεῖπε, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλάλησε· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ὢν ἀνθρωπος ἐφαίνετο ἀνθρωπος, ὅτι ὁ ὢν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἦμεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ, ἐπεὶ ἀόρατον τὸ πνεῦμα, ὅτε ἀλήθεια τὸν ὢν ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ γὰρ ὢν ἐκεῖνα οὐκ ἐφαίνετο.

Again (b). *Theſe things were not done ſeemingly only, but in reality of truth; for if he appeared to be a Man when he was not ſo, he neither did remain the Spirit of God, which he truly was, ſince a Spirit is inviſible, nor was there any Truth in him; for he was not that which he appeared to be.* He thought it, you ſee, abſurdity enough to ſay, That Chriſt appeared what he was not. But what abſurdity can this be to them that ſay, it is conſtantly ſo in the Sacrament, where that appears ſo and ſo, which is not ſo, as the Bread and Wine, according to them, do's?

(c) *Id. lib. 5. cap. 7.* Quomodo igitur Chriſtus in carnis ſubſtantia reſurrexit & oſtendit diſcipulis figuram clavorum & apertionem lateris; hæc autem ſunt indicia carnis ejus quæ ſurrexit à mortuis; ſic & nos, inquit, ſuſcitabit per virtutem ſuam.

Again (c). *As Chriſt therefore roſe again in the Subſtance of our Fleſh, and ſhewed to his Diſciples the Print of the Nails and the Opening of his Side, and theſe are Indications of his Fleſh which aroſe from the Dead; ſo alſo, he ſays, he will raiſe us up by his Power.*

(d) *De carne Chriſti, c. 5.* Maluit, crede, naſci, quam aliqua ex parte mentiri, & quidem in ſemetipſum; ut carnem geſtaret ſine oſſibus duram, ſine muſculis ſolidam, ſine ſanguine cruentam, ſine tunica veſtitam, ſine fame eſurientem, ſine dentibus edentem, ſine lingua loquentem, ut phantaſma auribus fuerit ſermo ejus per imaginem vocis.

Tertullian alſo argues thus againſt *Marcion* (d). *Believe it, he choſe rather to be born* (which *Marcion* thought abſurd) *than in any reſpect to lie, and that againſt himſelf; ſo as to carry Fleſh about him hard without Bones, ſolid without Muſcles, bloody without Blood, cloathed without a Garment, craving Food without Hunger, eating without Teeth, ſpeaking without a Tongue, ſo that his Speech was a Phantaſm to Mens Ears by the image only of a Voice.* Then he inſtances in Chriſt's ſhewing his Hands and Feet to his Diſciples after his Reſurrection: *Behold,* ſays he, *it is I my ſelf; for a Spirit has not Fleſh and Bones.* But, as he goes on, according to *Marcion*'s Interpretation, *Behold, he cozens, and deceives, and circumvents*

Ecce fallit & decipit & circumvenit omnium oculos, omnium

all

all Mens Eyes, all Mens Senſes, all their Approaches and Touches. Thou therefore ſhouldſt not have brought down Chriſt from Heaven, but from ſome Society of Juglers, &c.

ſenſus, omnium acceſſus & contactus. Ergo jam Chriſtum non de cœlo deterre debueras, ſed de aliquo circulatorio cœtu, *&c.*

Again (*e*). *Now when the Fleſh of Chriſt is found to be a Falſity, it follows alſo, That all the things done by the Fleſh of Chriſt, are falſly acted; ſuch as his meeting Perſons, his touching them, his Converſation, and even his Miracles themſelves, &c.*

(*e*) *Idem. adv. Marcion. l.* 3. *c.* 8. Jam nunc cùm mendacium deprehenditur Chriſti caro; ſequitur ut & omnia quæ per carnem Chriſti geſta ſunt, mendacio geſta ſunt, congreſſus, contactus, convictus, ipſæ quoque virtutes. *Ibid.* An credam ei de interiore ſubſtantiæ, qui ſit de exteriore fruſtratus? Quomodo verax habebitur in occulto, qui fallax repertus in aperto?

And when *Marcion* had inſtanced in the Appearances of Angels to *Abraham* and to *Lot*, like Men, meeting with them, and eating, and doing that they were commanded, *Tertullian* anſwers (*f*), *Know that this is not granted neither, that thoſe Angels had only ſeeming Fleſh, but of a true, ſolid, humane Subſtance.*

(*f*) *Ibid. c.* 9. Scito, nec illud concedi tibi, ut putativa fuerit in Angelis caro, ſed veræ & ſolidæ ſubſtantiæ humanæ.

He adds afterwards (*g*), *It ſuffices me to define that, which is agreeable to God*, viz. *the truth of that thing, which he has made the Object of three Senſes that teſtifie it*, viz. *Sight, Touch, and Hearing.*

(*g*) *Ibid. c.* 10. Sufficit mihi hoc definire, quod Deo congruit, veritatem ſcilicet illius rei, quam tribus teſtibus ſenſibus objecit, viſui, tactui, auditui.

And again (*h*), *Thou now honoureſt thy God with the Title of Fallaciouſneſs, if he knew himſelf to be another thing, than what he made Men to believe he was.*

(*h*) *Ibid. c.* 11. Jam Deum tuum honoras fallaciæ titulo, ſi aliud ſe eſſe ſciebat, quam quod homines fecerat opinari.

And in his next Book againſt *Marcion* (*i*). *The Argument of the Woman that was a Sinner belongs to this, to prove that when ſhe kiſſed our Lord's Feet, watred them with her Tears, wiped them with her Hairs, and anointed them, ſhe then handled the Truth of a ſolid Body, and not an empty Phantôme.*

(*i*) *Lib.* 4. *c.* 18. Illius peccatricis feminæ argumentum eò pertinebit, ut cùm pedes Domini oſculis figeret, lacrymis inundaret, crinibus detergeret, unguento perduceret, ſolidi corporis veritatem, non phantaſma inane tractaverit.

Again, in the laſt Chapter (*k*). *Why do's he offer to their inſpection his Hands and his Feet, which are Members conſiſting of Bones, if he had no Bones? Why did he add*, and know that it is I my ſelf, *to wit, whom they had known before to have had a Body?*

(*k*) *Ibid. c.* 43. Cur autem inſpectui eorum manus & pedes ſuos offert, quæ membra ex oſſibus conſtant, ſi oſſa non habebat? Cur adjecit, *& ſcitote quod ego ſum*, quem ſcilicet corporeum retro noverant?

May not we ask, agreeably to this Reaſoning of *Tertullian*, Why do's Chriſt offer to our ſight the Accidents of Bread and Wine, if there be no Bread and Wine remaining in the Euchariſt; eſpecially when what we ſee, we knew to be Bread and Wine before?

But the moſt remarkable Teſtimony of *Tertullian*'s is in his Book *de Anima* (*l*), where on ſet purpoſe he oppoſes the *Academicks*, that would not have Men give credit to their Senſes. He urges againſt them, *That there is no Abuſe of the Senſes but has a Cauſe of it; and if thoſe Cauſes deceive the Senſes, and our Opinions by them, the Fallacy is not to be charged upon our Senſes, that follow thoſe Cauſes; nor upon our Opinions, that are directed by our Senſes, which follow thoſe Cauſes.* ——And aftewards he cries out, *O thou malapert Academy, what doſt thou do?* (in charging Deceit upon the Senſes) *Thou overturneſt the whole State of Life, thou diſturbeſt all the Order of Nature, thou blindeſt the Providence of God himſelf, who* (according to thee) *has ſet lying and deceitful Senſes as Lords over all his Works, for to underſtand, inhabit, diſpenſe, and enjoy them, &c.* ——*It is no ways lawful and fit to call thoſe Senſes in queſtion, leſt we ſhould doubt of their Credit even in Chriſt himſelf; leſt it ſhould be ſaid, that he falſly ſaw Satan thrown down from Heaven, or falſly heard his Fathers Voice teſtifying concerning him, or was deceived when he touched* Peter's *Wives Mother, or perceived afterwards a different Scent of the Ointment which he accepted for his Burial, and afterwards a different Taſte of the Wine which he conſecrated in memory of his Blood.* ——*Neither was Nature abuſed in his Apoſtles. Faithful was their Sight and Hearing in the Mount; faithful* and true *was the Taſte of that Wine which was Water before, at the Marriage in* Galilee; *faithful was* Thomas's *Touch, who thereupon believed.*

(*l*) *De Anima, cap.* 17.

Nulla ſenſuum fruſtratio cauſâ caret, quod ſi cauſæ fallunt ſenſus, & per ſenſus opiniones, jam nec in ſenſibus conſtituenda fallacia eſt, qui cauſas ſequuntur, nec in opinionibus qui ſenſibus diriguntur ſequentibus cauſas —— Quid agis, Academia procaciſſima? Totum vitæ ſtatum evertis, omnem naturæ ordinem turbas, ipſius Dei providentiam excœcas, qui cunctis operibus ſuis intelligendis, incolendis, diſpenſandis, fruendiſque fallaces & mendaces Dominos præfecerit ſenſus, *&c.*

——Non licet, non licet nobis in dubium ſenſus iſtos devocare, ne & in Chriſto de fide eorum deliberetur; nè ſortè dicatur, quod falſò Satanam proſpectarit de cœlo præcipitatum; aut falſò vocem Patris audierit de ipſo teſtificatam; aut deceptus ſit cùm Petri ſocrum tetigit, aut alium poſteà unguenti ſpiritum ſenſerit, quod in ſepulturam ſuam acceptavit; *alium poſteà vini ſaporem, quod in ſanguinis ſui memoriam conſecravit.* — Atqui nè in Apoſtolis quidem ejus ludificata natura eſt. Fidelis fuit & viſus & auditus in monte; fidelis & guſtus vini illius, licet aquæ ante, in nuptiis Galilææ; fidelis & tactus exinde creduli Thomæ.

Recite

Recite John's *Teſtimony: That which we have ſeen*, ſays he, *which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our Eyes, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life. This is all a falſe Teſtification, if the Nature of the Senſe of our Eyes, and Ears, and Hands is a Lie and a Cheat.*

And in the next Chapter (*m*). *The Underſtanding ſeems to uſe Senſe as a Leader, an Author, and principal Foundation; neither can Truths be laid hold of without it.*

S. *Auſtin* teaches the ſame (*n*) Doctrine. *Our Eyes do not deceive us, for they can only report to the Mind how they are affected.* ——*If one thinks that an Oar is broken in the Water, and when it is taken out of the Water made whole again, he has not a Bad Reporter, but he is an ill Judge. For the Eye, according to its Nature, neither could nor ought to perceive it otherwiſe while in the Water; For if the Air is a different* Medium *from Water, it muſt perceive it one ways in the Air, and another ways in Water. Therefore the Eye ſees rightly; for it was made only to ſee: But the Mind judges amiſs, &c.*

So alſo S. *Hillary* (*o*). *He takes away their fooliſh Raſhneſs, who contend that our Lord was ſeen in the Fleſh in a deceitful and falſe Body; that the Father feigning Truth, ſhewed him in the habit of falſe Fleſh,* (as the *Romaniſts* make Chriſt's Body to be ſhewn *in habitu falſi panis*) *not remembring what was ſaid after his Reſurrection to the Apoſtles that thought they ſaw a Spirit;* Why are ye troubled, *&c.* Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my ſelf; for a Spirit has not Fleſh and Bones, as ye ſee me have.

Recita Johannis *teſtimonium: Quod vidimus, inquit, quod audivimus, oculis noſtris vidimus, & manus noſtræ contrectaverunt de ſermone vitæ. Falſa utique teſtatio, ſi oculorum & aurium & manuum ſenſus naturam mentitur.*

(*m*) *Cap.* 18. *Videtur intellectus duce uti ſenſu, & auctore & principali fundamento, nec ſine illo veritates poſſe contingi.*

(*n*) *De vera Relig. cap.* 33. *Ne ipſi quidem oculi fallunt; non enim renunciare poſſunt animo niſi affectionem ſuam.*—— *Si quis remum frangi in aqua opinatur, & cum inde aufertur integrari, non habet malum internuncium, ſed malus eſt judex. Nam ille pro natura ſua non potuit aliter in aqua ſentire, nec aliter debuit. Si enim aliud eſt aer, aliud aqua, juſtum eſt ut aliter in aere, aliter in aqua ſentiatur. Quare oculus rectè videt; ad hoc enim factus eſt ut tantum videat: ſed animus perverſe judicat, &c.*

(*o*) *In Pſal.* 137. *Tollit ſtultiſſimam eorum temeritatem, qui fruſtrato falſóque corpore Dominum in carne viſum eſſe contendunt; ut eum Pater mentita veritate in habitu falſæ carnis oſtenderit; non recordantes poſt reſurrectionem corporis ſpiritum ſe videre credentibus Apoſtolis dictum eſſe, Quid conturbati, &c. videte manus & pedes meos, quoniam ipſe ego ſum, palpate & videte, quoniam ſpiritus carnem & oſſa non habet, ſicut me videtis habere.*

Epiphanius (*p*) is very large in arguing the Truth of Chriſt's Body, from what was ſenſibly done to his Body; and if he argues truly, then what is ſenſibly done to the Bread in the Euchariſt, proves the Truth of Bread remaining, and not only the Appearance of it.

(*p*) *Hæreſ.* 42.

(q) *Ibid. Refut.* 4. Πῶς συλληφθεὶς σταυρῶ, ὁ μὴ ὢν ἅπτου ἀφλῶ ὢν πάντων καὶ ἃ φησὶν λόγεις; — ὃ γὰρ δύνασαι φαντασίαν θεὸς ὢν ἃ ὕστερον ὢν ἀφλῶ πάντα δεικνύμενον.

He asks *Marcion* (q), *How could he be taken and crucified, if, according to thy saying, he could not be handled?* —— *For thou canst not define him to be a Phantôme, whom thou confessest to fall under the Touch.*

(r) *Ibid. Refut.* 10. & 11. Σῶμα ὀγκηρὸν τὸ καλαικείμενον.

Again (r) he argues, That Christ had a true Body, because he went into the Pharisee's House and sat down. *That which sits down, is a bulky Body.*

Οὐ φαντασίας πόδας.
Τῆς ἅψης τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἀλλαπτικόν.

And when the Woman washed his Feet with her Tears, he adds, *Not the Feet of a Phantôme.* And kissed them, *perceiving his Body by her Touch.* And, *What Feet did she kiss, but the Feet made up of Flesh and Bones, and other Parts?*

(s) *Ibid. Refut.* 14. Οὐκ ἀέρα ἥψατο, ἀλλ' ἀρῶς ἀνθρωπείας.

So again (s), the Woman that touched Christ and was healed, *she did not touch Air, but something Humane that might be touched.*

(t) *Ib. Refut.* 16. Δόκησις ἢ ἀνεμα, ἢ πτῶμα, ἢ φαντασία, κηδείας καὶ τάφου οὐκ ἀντιδίκου καὶ ἀνάστασιν.

Again (t). *An Imaginary thing, or Wind, or a Spirit or Phantôme, admits neither of Burial nor a Resurrection.* But why may not a Phantôme as well be buried and raised, as Accidents be broken and distributed, when no Bread remains?

(u) *Refut.* 65.

Ὑπ' ἀφλῶ τῆς μαθήσεως ἐυεστικώς.

Again, he observes (u) from that of his kneeling down and praying, That all this was done ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, because his Disciples saw him, *and he was found to his Disciples under their Touch.*

(x) *Ibid. Refut.* 71.

So also concerning Christ's Crucifixion, he observes (x), That the piercing his Hands and Feet with Nails, and handling of them to do it, could not be δόκησις καὶ φάντασμα, *an imagination or shew.* But if the *Church of Rome* say true, he is out; for it is only δόκησις and a Phantôme, when I chew and fasten my Teeth in the Host, there being no Substance that I bite.

(y) *Ibid. Refut.* 77. Πόθεν ἡ κλάσις ἦ ἄρτου ἐγένετο;

Ὑπὸ φαντασίας.

(z) Ἐνεργοῦντος ὀγκηροῦ καὶ ἀληθείας.

He afterwards (y) challenges *Marcion* from that Expression, *He was known in breaking of Bread. How*, says he, *was this breaking of Bread performed? was it by a Phantôme, or from a Body (z) bulky, and really acting it?*

Here

Here I may well observe, That if the very breaking of Bread, argues a true Body that did perform that thing; how much more forcible is our Question to the *Romanists*, What means the mention of Bread broken in the Eucharist, (as Christ is said to break Bread) if nothing be broken at all but only in shew and appearance?

Epiphanius also elsewhere (*a*) says, when Christ shewed to them *Moses* and *Elias* in the Mount, *He did not present an Image or a Phantôme, as intending to deceive his Apostles; but shew'd what they were really.*

(*a*) *Heres.* 64. *sec.* 36. Οὐκ εἴδωλον ἢ φάντασμα τοῦ Ἀποστόλους βουλόμενος ἀπατᾶν, ἀλλ' ὃ ἦσαν ἀψευδῶς.

Athanasius (*b*) says, *Christ did both eat Meat, and permitted his Body to be touched by his Disciples, that not only their Eyes, but also their Fingers might be brought in for Witnesses of the Truth; so removing all suspicion of a Phantôme or Ghostly Appearance.*

(*b*) *Orat.* 2. *de Ascen. Christi.*

Λύσας τὴν φαντασίας τὴν ὑποψίαν.

S. *Chrysostome* (*c*) brings in Christ saying thus. *It is not my way to mock* or abuse *mine with a false appearance. If the Sight is afraid of a vain Image, the Hands and Fingers may find out the Truth of my Body. Perhaps some Mist may deceive the Eyes; but a corporal Touch owns a Body.*

(*c*) *De Resurrect. Hom.* 9. *Lat. Paris.* 1588. *Tom.* 3. *pag.* 775. Non est meum meos ludificare phantasmate; vanam imaginem visus si timet, veritatem corporis manus & digitus exploret. Potest fortasse aliqua oculos caligo decipere, palpatio corporalis verum corpus agnoscat.

Also elsewhere (*d*), speaking of Seeing and Hearing, he says, *By these Senses we learn all things exactly, and seem Teachers worthy of credit, concerning such things which we receive by our Sight or Hearing, seeing we neither feign, nor speak falsly.*

(*d*) *Hom.* 29 *in Joan.* Διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τούτων ἡμεῖς πάντα μανθάνομεν ἀκριβῶς, καὶ ἀξιόπιστοι δοκοῦμεν εἶναι διδάσκαλοι, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἢ ὄψει παραλάβομεν, ἢ ἀκοῇ δεξάμεθον.

But lest any one should pretend, that the Eucharist is a Mystery, and that in such things our Senses may impose on us, and deceive us, it is very remarkable how this Father distinguishes betwixt them.

He tells us (*e*) wherein *Deception* do's consist, viz. *when a thing do's not appear to be what it is, but appears to be what it is not.* But he makes a Mystery to be another thing (*f*), viz. *when we see not what we believe, but see one thing, and believe another thing: For this,* says he, *is the Nature of our Mysteries.*

(*e*) *Hom.* 13. *in Ep. ad Ephes.* Ὅταν τι ὄντι μὴ φαίνηται, ἀλλ' ὅπερ μὴ ὄντι δείκνυται.

(*f*) *Hom.* 7. *in* 1 *ad Cor.* Μυστήριον καλεῖται, ὅτι οὐχ ἅπερ ὁρῶμεν πιστεύομεν, ἀλλ' ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν καὶ ἕτερα πιστεύομεν· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τῶν μυστηρίων ἡμῶν φύσις, &c.

S. *Austin*

S. *Auſtin* (g) makes the concurrent Teſtimony of Senſe, eſpecially that of Feeling, to give ſufficient aſſurance to us. Thus he ſays. *There is no cauſe to doubt of Chriſt's Reſurrection, whoſe preſence the Eye do's own, the Hand handles, and the Fingers examine.* ——*If we perhaps ſhould ſay, That* Thomas *his Eyes were deceived, yet we cannot ſay ſo of his Hands; for in clearing the Reſurrection, doubt may be made of the Sight, but no doubt can be made of Feeling.*

Again elſewhere (b). *Who but Devils, that are Friends to Cozenage, could perſuade them, that Chriſt deceived Men, when he ſuffered, when he died, and when he ſhowed his Scars?*

Again (i). *This, which is like Magick, ye are ſaid to aſſert, That Chriſt's Paſſion and Death was only in appearance, and in a deceitful Shadow; ſo that he ſeemed to die, when he did not die. Whence it follows, that you muſt aſſert alſo his Reſurrection to be in ſhew, imaginary, and fallacious. For he cannot be truly raiſed, who did not truly die: And if ſo, then he ſhewed falſe Scars to his doubting Diſciples; neither did* Thomas *cry out,* My Lord and my God, *becauſe he was confirmed in the Truth, but becauſe he was deceived by a Cheat.*

Suitably to which, he aſſerts in another place (k), *If the Body of Chriſt was a Phantôme, Chriſt deceived us; and if he deceive us, he is not the Truth. But Chriſt is the Truth; therefore the Body of Chriſt was not a Phantaſtical Body.*

(g) *Serm. de Temp.* 161. Cujus præſentiam agnoſcat oculus, attrectet manus, digitus perſcrutetur. ——Si fortè diceremus Thomæ oculos fuiſſe deceptos, at non poſſemus dicere manus fruſtratas; in reſurrectionis enim manifeſtatione de aſpectu ambigi poteſt, de tactu non poteſt dubitari.

(b) *Contra Fauſtum, l.* 14. *c.* 10. Qui niſi Dæmones, quibus amica fallacia eſt, iſtis perſuaderent, Quod Chriſtus fallaciter paſſus, fallaciter mortuus ſit, fallaciter cicatrices oſtenderit?

(i) *Ibid. l.* 29. *c.* 2. Illud eſt quod Magiæ ſimile dicimini aſſerere, quod paſſionem mortemque ejus ſpecie tenus factam & fallaciter dicitis adumbratam, ut mori videretur, qui non moriebatur. Ex quo fit, ut ejus quoque reſurrectionem umbraticam, imaginariam fallacemque dicatis: Neque enim ejus, qui non verè mortuus eſt, vera eſſe reſurrectio poteſt: ita fit, ut & cicatrices diſcipulis dubitantibus falſas oſtenderit, nec Thomas veritate confirmatus, ſed fallacia deceptus clamaret, *Dominus meus, & Deus meus, &c.*

(k) *Lib.* 83. *Queſtion. Queſt.* 14. Si phantaſma fuit corpus Chriſti, fefellit Chriſtus: & ſi fallit, veritas non eſt. Eſt autem veritas Chriſtus; non igitur phantaſma fuit corpus ejus.

Now againſt all theſe plain Teſtimonies, I know only one Objection can be made, which we are to conſider, *viz.*

Objection. *That ſome of the Fathers call upon us not to believe our Senſes, nor to regard their Information; and that particularly they do ſo in the Caſe of the Euchariſt.*

To this Objection, I ſhall give theſe ſatisfactory Anſwers.

Anſ. 1.

Ans. 1. *It is certain, that the Fathers appeal to our Senses even in the matter of the Eucharist.* We have seen Instances before, particularly in *Tertullian*; to which let me add one remarkable Testimony out of S. *Austin* (*l*). *This which you see upon God's Altar, you were shewn last night; but you have not yet heard what it is, what it meaneth, and of how great a Thing it is a Sacrament. That which you see, is Bread and the Cup; thus much your own Eyes inform you, &c.* He appeals to their Eyes, you see, as to the Elements before them, and suppose, that when they tell them there is Bread and a Cup, they were not deceived. But then he informs them of that which their Senses could not be judge of, because not an Object of them, which was understood by the Bread and the Cup, as we shall hear afterwards.

(*l*) *Serm. ad recen. Baptizat. apud Fulgentium, Bedam, &c.* Hoc quod videtis in altari Dei etiam transacta nocte vidistis: sed quid esset, quid sibi vellet, quam magnæ rei Sacramentum contineret nondum audistis. Quod ergo videtis, panis est & calix, quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renunciant, *&c.*

Ans 2. *The Fathers call upon Men not to regard the Information of their Senses, in matters wherein yet none questions the truth and certainty of their Information.* Therefore this is no Argument to question the Truth of what our Senses inform us of in the Eucharist, because they would not have us to regard them.

Thus *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* (*m*), speaking of holy Chrism. *Take heed you do not think*, says he, *this to be meer simple Ointment.* Sense indeed reaches no further than that; but then comparing Chrism with the Eucharist, (which is not to be look'd upon as common Bread after Consecration) he adds, *We are to look upon this* Holy Ointment *not as bare and common Ointment, after Consecration; but as the Grace of Christ, &c.*

(*m*) *Catech. Mystag.* 3. Ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι.

Καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλόν, οὐδὲ κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, *&c.*

So also he says of Baptism (*n*), *Come not to the Font as to simple and meer Water, but to the Spiritual Grace that is given together with the Water.* And a litle after, *Being*, says he, *about to descend into the Water, do not attend to the simpleness of the Water.* And yet, for all this, he never intended to deny it to be true Water.

(*n*) *Idem Catech. Illum.* 3. Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ προσέλθε τῷ λουτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τῶν ὕδατος διδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι. Μὴ τῷ ψιλῷ τῶν ὕδατος προσέχε, *&c.*

Gelasius Cyzic. (*o*). *We are not to consider our Baptism with sensitive, but with Intellectual Eyes.*

(*o*) *Diatypos. c.* 4. Τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν οὐ τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κατανοητέον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς νοηροῖς.

Or,

Or, as S. *Auſtin* ſays (p), *You ought not to make an Eſtimate of thoſe Waters with your Eyes, but with your Mind.*

Thus alſo S. *Ambroſe* (q), ſpeaking of Baptiſm. *As to what thou haſt ſeen, to wit, the Waters, and not thoſe alone, but Levites there miniſtring, and the Biſhop asking Queſtions and Conſecrating: Firſt of all, the Apoſtle has taught thee, That we are* not to look upon the things that are ſeen, but on the things that are not ſeen, *&c. Do not therefore only believe thy bodily Eyes: That is rather ſeen, which is not ſeen; becauſe that is Temporal, this is Eternal, which is not comprehended by our Eyes, but is ſeen by our Mind and Underſtanding.*

S. *Chryſoſtom* (r), ſpeaking alſo of Baptiſm, thus breaks out. *Let us believe God's Affirmation, for this is more faithful than our Sight; for our Sight often is deceived, that is impoſſible to fall to the Ground.*

It is ſo frequent an Expreſſion of S. *Chryſoſtome, That God's Word is more to be credited than our Eyes,* that he applies it not only to the Sacraments, but even to the Caſe of Alms-giving: For thus he ſays (s); *Let us be ſo affected when we give Alms to the Poor, as if we gave them to Chriſt himſelf: For his Words are more ſure than our Sight. Therefore when thou ſeeſt a poor Man, remember the Words whereby Chriſt ſignified, that he himſelf is fed. For tho' what is ſeen is not Chriſt, yet under this ſhape he receives thy Alms, and asks it.*

Anſ. 3. *The Fathers in the matter of Signs and Sacraments therefore call upon us not to liſten to our Senſes, and credit them, becauſe, in ſuch Caſes, they would have us to conſider things beyond and above their information; ſuch as relate to their Uſe and Efficacy; theſe being ſpiritual things ſignified by what is viſible, wherein they place the Myſtery, and which Senſe can neither diſcover nor judge of.*

S. *Auſtin* has a Rule (t) in this Caſe. *I ſay this, treating of Signs; in which none ought to attend to what they are, but rather that they are Signs,*

(p) *Serm.* 2. *in Append. Sermon.* 40. *à Sirmondo Editor.* Non debetis aquas illas oculis æſtimare, ſed mente.

(q) *De his qui initiantur, c.* 3. Quod vidiſti aquas utique, ſed non ſolas, Levitas illic miniſtrantes, ſummum Sacerdotem interrogantem & conſecrantem. Primo omnium docuit te Apoſtolus, *non ea contemplanda nobis quæ videntur, ſed quæ non videntur, &c.* Non ergo *ſolis corporis tui oculis credas.* Magis videtur quod non videtur, quia iſtud temporale, illud æternum aſpicitur, quod oculis non comprehenditur, animo autem & mente cernitur.

(r) *In Joan. Hom.* 24. Πειθώμεθα τοίνυν τῇ ἀποφάσει τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅλως γὰρ δεῖ αὐτὴ πιστεύειν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὄψις πολλαχοῦ καὶ σφάλλεται, ἐκεῖνο δὲ ἀμήχανον διαπεσεῖν.

(s) *Hom.* 89. *in Matth.* Τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ τῶν ὄψεων ἡμῶν πιστότερα. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον οὐκ ἔστι Χριστός, ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σχήματι αὐτὸς λαμβάνει καὶ προσαιτεῖ.

(t) De Doctr. Chriſt. *l.* 2. *c.* 1. De ſignis differens, hoc dico, ne quis in eis attendat quod ſunt,

Signs, that is, that they ſignifie. For a Sign is a thing, which, beſides what appears affecting the Senſes, do's of it ſelf make ſomewhat elſe to come into our thoughts.

ſed potius quod ſigna ſunt, id eſt, quod ſignificant. Signum eſt enim res, præter ſpeciem quam ingerit ſenſibus, aliud aliquid ex ſe faciens in cogitationem venire.

So alſo *Origen* (*u*) deſcribes a Sign to be *a Note of another thing beſides that which the Senſe gives teſtimony to.*

(*u*) *In Joan. tom.* 18. *ad finem.* Σύμβολον ἑτέρου, πρὸς τὸ αἰσθητῶς μαρτυρούμενον.

But none has ſo fully declared this Matter, and anſwered the former Objection, as S. *Chryſoſtome*, in the place forecited, whoſe Words deſerve to be ſet down at large (*x*). Where treating of Baptiſm, the Euchariſt, and other Myſteries, after he has told us (as we heard before) what a Myſtery is, *viz.* When we do not meerly believe what we ſee, *but ſee one thing and believe another*, he goes on thus.

(*x*) *In* 1 *Cor. Hom.* 7. *Edit. Savil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 280. Ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν καὶ ἕτερα πιστεύομεν.

I and an Infidel are diverſly affected with them. I hear that Chriſt was crucified, I preſently admire his Benignity: He hears the ſame, and he counts it Infirmity. I hear that he was made a Servant, and I admire his Care: He, when he hears the ſame, counts it Infamy. And ſo he goes on with his Death and Reſurrection, and the different Judgment is made of them, and proceeds to ſpeak of the Sacraments. *The Infidel hearing of the Laver* (of Baptiſm) *eſteems it ſimply Water; but I do not look meerly upon what I ſee, but regard the cleanſing of the Soul by the Spirit. He thinks that my Body only is waſhed; but I believe that my Soul is made clean and holy; I reckon the Burial, Reſurrection, Sanctification, Righteouſneſs, Redemption, Adoption of Sons, the Inheritance, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Supply of the Spirit. For, I do not judge of the things that appear by my Sight, but by the Eyes of my Mind. I hear of the Body of Chriſt. I underſtand what is ſaid, one way; an Infidel, another.* Which he further illuſtrates admirably thus. *As Children looking upon Books, know not the Power of Letters, underſtand not what they look upon; nay, even to a grown Man that is unlearned, it will be the ſame, when a Man of Skill will find out much hidden Virtue, Laws, and Hiſtories contained therein. And if one of no skill receive a Letter, he will judge it only to be Paper and Ink; but he that has*

Ἀκούων λουτροῦ ἐκεῖνος, ἁπλῶς ὕδωρ νομίζει· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ τὸ ὁρώμενον ἁπλῶς βλέπω, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρμὸν τὸν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, &c.

Οὐ γὰρ τῇ ὄψει κρίνω τὰ φαινόμενα, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς διανοίας· ἀκούω σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ἑτέρως ἐγὼ νοῶ τὸ εἰρημένον, ἑτέρως ὁ ἄπιστος.

Οὕτω καὶ ὀπὶ τῶν μυστηρίου γίνεται· οἱ μὲν ἄπιστοι καὶ τοίγε ἀκούοντες, οὐ δοκοῦσιν ἀκούειν· οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ διὰ τῶν πνεύματος ἔχοντες ἐμπειρίαν, ὁρῶσι τῶν ἐναποκειμένων τὴν δύναμιν.

Skill hears an absent Person speak, and discourses with him, and speaks what he pleases to him again by his Letters. Just thus it is in a Mystery; Unbelievers hearing, seem not to hear; but the Believers, being taught Skill by the Spirit, perceive the Power of the hidden things.

This Discourse of S. *Chrysostome*'s explains a Place of S. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* (y), and teaches us how to understand it; where speaking of the Eucharist, he says, *Do not consider it as bare Bread and Wine; for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to our Lord's Affirmation. And altho Sense suggests this to thee, let Faith confirm thee. Do not judge of the Matter by thy Taste; but by Faith be undoubtedly persuaded, that thou art honoured with the Body and Blood of Christ.*

(y) *Catech.* 4. *Mystag.* Μὴ πρόσεχε ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὸν διαπεπτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις βεβαίουτω· μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πρᾶγμα, &c.

And afterwards: *Being fully persuaded, that the visible Bread is not Bread, tho' the Taste perceive it such, but the Body of Christ; and the visible Wine is not Wine, tho' the Taste would have it so, but the Blood of Christ.*

Πληροφορηθεὶς, ὡς ὁ φαινόμενος ἄρτος, οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστὶν, εἰ καὶ τῇ γεύσει αἰσθητὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὁ φαινόμενος οἶνος, οὐκ οἶνος ἐστὶν, εἰ καὶ ἡ γεῦσις τοῦτο βούλεται, ἀλλὰ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

All which must be only understood of the Sacramental Relation that the *Bread* and *Wine* have to the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, which the Sense of Tasting acquaints us nothing at all with, and therefore is not a fit Judge of this; but we are to believe, and not doubt of its Truth.

It will also help us to understand another Place of S. *Chrysostome*, (*Homil.* 83. *in Matth.*) where he bids us, *Believe God every where, without contradicting him, tho' what he says seems contrary to our Reasonings, and to our Eyes; but let his Word prevail above our Reasonings and our Eyes. Let us do the same in the Mysteries, not fixing our Eyes only upon the things set before us, but let us hold fast his Words: For his Word cannot deceive us; but our Sense easily may: That can never fall to the ground; but this often fails. Since therefore the Word says,* This is my Body, *let us be persuaded of it and believe it, and look upon it with intellectual Eyes: For Christ has given us nothing sensible,*

Πειθώμεθα πανταχοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ μηδὲν ἀντιλέγωμεν κἂν ἐναντίον ᾖ δοκῇ τοῖς ἡμετέροις λογισμοῖς καὶ ταῖς ὄψεσι τὸ λεγόμενον, &c.

Οὐ τοῖς κειμένοις μόνον ἐμβλέποντες, ἀλλὰ τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ κατέχωμεν, &c.

Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ λόγος φησὶ, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, καὶ πειθώμεθα, καὶ πιστεύωμεν, καὶ νοητοῖς αὐτὸ βλέπωμεν ὀφθαλμοῖς· οὐδὲν

ſible, but in ſenſible things all things intelligible. Thus in Baptiſm, by what is ſenſibly done, there is the Gift of Water; but what is perfected, is intelligible, viz. our Regeneration and Renovation.

If the Reader do's but remember that Baptiſm is as much concerned in this Diſcourſe of S. *Chryſoſtome*, as the Euchariſt; and that we are as much required not to truſt our Eyes, that may deceive us, but to truſt the Word of God in the one caſe as well as the other; it will not give the leaſt countenance to the Abſurdities of Tranſubſtantiation.

And as for thoſe Words of his, *That Chriſt delivered nothing ſenſible to us*, they muſt be underſtood with an abatement, That we are not to be intent and to fix our Thoughts meerly upon what we ſee; for elſe it is certain, that there is ſomething ſenſible delivered in the Euchariſt, elſe there would be no Sign nor no Sacrament; and that *Father* would contradict himſelf, who in the very next Words tells us, That *by ſenſible things he has delivered intelligible* (that is, ſpiritual) *things to us*; for which he brings what is beſtowed upon us in Baptiſm as a Proof.

δὲ αἰσθητὸν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλ' αἰσθητοῖς μὲν πράγμασι παντὰ ἡ νοητά· οἷον καὶ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τὸ μὲν αἰσθητὸν μὲν πράγμα ἐστὶ τὸ ὕδωρ· τὸ δὲ νοητὸν ἡ τὸ τελούμενον, ἤτοι ἡμῶν καὶ ἀναγέννησις.

CHAP. VII.

The Seventh Difference.

When the Fathers call the Euchariſt Chriſt's Body and Blood, the Roman Church underſtands it of Chriſts natural Body given there. But the Fathers do not ſo; but underſtand it moſt commonly of the Elements of Bread and Wine, even when they call them the Body of Chriſt, and give us the reaſons why they ſo call them.

I Need not tell you, how the Romiſh Writers catch at every place of the Fathers, where they meet with the mention of *Chriſts Body and Blood:* all their Citations are full of little elſe but Teſtimonies of this kind.

But if they had a mind to underſtand their ſenſe, and did not meerly liſten to the ſound of their words, they would quickly ſee them interpret themſelves, ſo that there could be no miſtake, nor countenance given hereby to Tranſubſtantiation, or any preſence of Chriſt but what is ſpiritual. Which by a few Obſervations out of them will appear.

I. Obſerv. *The Fathers give us warning of it, and tell us, That they ſtudiouſly conceal and hide the Myſteries from ſome perſons, both out of the Church, and in it.* Therefore their meer expreſſions concerning it, are not ſufficient to inform us of their meaning.

Thus *Cyril of Jeruſalem* (*a*) tells us, *That we do not ſpeak openly of the myſteries among the Catechumens, but often ſpeak many things covertly, that the faithful that are acquainted with the matter, may underſtand it, and they that are unacquainted may not be hurt.*

(*a*) *Catech. Illum.* 6. *pag.* 149. *Edit.* 4. *Pariſ.* 1608. Ἀλλὰ πολλὰ πολλάκις λέγομεν ἐπικαλυμμένως, &c.

S. Auſtin (*b*) in like manner. *What is it that is hidden and not publick in the Church? The Sacrament of Baptiſm, and the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. The very Pagans ſee our good works, but the Sacraments are hid from them.*

(*b*) *In Pſal.* 103. Quid eſt quod occultum eſt, & non publicum in Eccleſia? Sacramentum Baptiſmi, Sacramentum Euchariſtiæ. Opera noſtra bona vident & Pagani, Sacramenta vero occultantur illis.

S.

S. *Chryſoſtome* (*c*) (upon thoſe words, *why are they then Baptized for the dead*) ſays, *I have a mind to ſpeak it openly, but I dare not, becauſe of them that are not initiated. For they make our Expoſition more difficult, compelling us either not to ſpeak plainly, or to declare to them things that ought to be conceal'd.*

(*c*) *In* 1 *Cor.* 15. *Hom.* 40.

Οὐ τολμῶ δὲ διὰ τοὺς ἀμυήτους.

Ἢ μὴ λέγειν σαφῶς, ἢ εἰς ἀυτοὺς ἐκφέρειν τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα.

Upon this account they concealed what was apt to be deſpiſed (whether they did well or no in this I ſhall not here queſtion) ſcarce vouchſafing to name the viſible Elements, but mentioning them with more glorious Titles, ſuch as could not be diſregarded. Thus they called *Baptiſm* by the name of φώτισμα, *illumination*; and they called the *Euchariſt*, the *Sacrifice*, quod norunt fideles, *which the faithful know*, (thus concealing it) or *the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. They call the Lords *Table* an *Altar*, and the *Miniſters Prieſts*, tho' all theſe are to be underſtood in a figurative and improper ſenſe.

Thus S. *Auſtin* ſays (*d*), *Almoſt all call the Sacrament the Body of Chriſt*. Which very phraſe ſhews, that the *Sacrament* is not in ſubſtance Chriſts *natural Body*. For who would phraſe it ſo, *almoſt all call it*, in giving a proper name to a thing? *ex. gr.* would any ſay, that almoſt all call a Houſe a Houſe, or a Man a Man? but to ſay, that almoſt all call Kings Gods, tells you, that however for certain Reaſons, *Kings* are called *Gods*, yet they are not really and properly ſo.

(*d*) *De verb. Dom. Serm.* 53. Penè quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt.

The ſame Father (*e*) ſpeaking of ſeveral things, whereby Chriſt may be ſignified and ſet forth, either by words written, or ſpoken, *&c.* he ſays, *We do not call theſe the Body and Blood of Chriſt, but that only, which being taken from the fruits of the earth, is rightly received by us to our ſpiritual health*, &c.

(*e*) *De Trinit.* l. 3. c. 4. —Sed illud tantum quod ex fructibus terræ acceptum & prece myſtica conſecratum, ritè ſumimus ad ſalutem ſpiritualem, *&c.*

If the other things had been called ſo, any one would have underſtood it muſt be improperly ſo called, and ſo muſt this too, as his following words tell us, that *even this is not ſanctified to become ſo great a Sacrament, but by the inviſible operation of the Spirit of God.*

Non ſanctificatur ut ſit tam magnum Sacramentum, niſi operante inviſibiliter Spiritu Dei.

So

(f) *Orig. Lib. 6. cap. 19.* Eo (sc. *Christo*) jubente, corpus Christi & sanguinem dicimus, quod dum fit ex fructibus terræ, sanctificatur, & fit Sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.

So *Isidore* of *Sevil* (f) gives the same account, *By the command of Christ, we call the Body and Blood of Christ, that which being made of the fruits of the earth, is sanctified and made a Sacrament by the invisible operation of the spirit of God.*

2. Observ. *The Fathers oft-times in their very manner of speaking concerning the Body and Blood of Christ, point at another thing than his Natural Body; so that we need no Commentary upon their words to explain them, for they carry at first hearing our sense and meaning in them, and not that of the Romanists.* To give a few instances.

(g) *Epist. 63. ad Cæcilium.* Cùm dicat Christus, *ego sum vitis vera*, sanguis Christi non aqua est utiq; sed vinum — Quomodo nec Corpus Domini potest esse farina sola, aut aqua sola, nisi utrumq; adunatum fuerit & copulatum, & panis unius compagine solidatum.

S. *Cyprian* (g) discoursing against those that Consecated and drank only Water in the Sacrament, says, *When Christ says,* I am the true Vine, *the Blood of Christ it's plain is not Water but Wine.* —— *So neither can the Lords Body be flour alone, or water alone, unless both of them be united, and coupled and kneaded together into one Loaf.*

Where no Body can doubt of S. *Cyprian*'s meaning, that by *Christs Body* he understands not his *natural Body*, but the *Sacrament* of it.

(h) *Pandect. Canon.* p. 565. Μηδὲν πλέον τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου προσενεχθείη, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος παρέδωκεν· τοῦτ' ἔστι ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ὕδατι μεμιγμένου.

And so the *Council of Carthage*, (h) decreed against the *Armenians* (who made use of Wine only in the Eucharist) *That nothing shall be offered, but the Body and Blood of Christ, as the Lord himself delivered it,* (the phrase carries its sense in the face of it, if they had said no more, but they add) *that is, Bread and Wine mixed with Water.*

(i) *Dialog.* 1. Τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα· τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος, &c.

What can be more plain than that of *Theodoret* (i), when he says, *That our Saviour changed the names, and on his Body he put the name of the sign* (or symbol) *and on the sign the name of his Body?* A little before he shows how. *You know,* says he, *that God called his Body Bread, and elsewhere he called his flesh Wheat* (σῖτον), except a Corn of Wheat fall to the Earth and die, Matth. 12. *But in the delivery of the mysteries, he called Bread his Body, and that which is mixed* (κρᾶμα) *Blood.* Is it not clear, that neither in one case, nor the other, these sayings

ſayings are to be underſtood properly, but figuratively? Eſpecially when *Theodoret*, before all I now have cited, makes this compariſon. *As after Conſecration, we call the myſtical fruit of the Vine the Lords blood; ſo he* (Jacob) *called the Blood of the true Vine, the Blood of the Grape.* Both the one and the other muſt be figuratively underſtood.

Ib. Ὥσπερ οὖν μυστικὸν τὸ ἀμπέλου καρπὸν μετὰ τὴν ἁγιασμὸν αἷμα δεσποτικὸν ὀνομάζομεν, οὕτω τὸν ἀληθινῆς ἀμπέλου τὸ αἷμα σταφυλῆς ὠνόμασεν αἷμα.

When S. *Cyprian* in the forecited Epiſtle (*k*) ſays, that ſome might make it an Objection, that by partaking of the Communion early in the Morning, they might be diſcovered to the Heathen Perſecutors by the ſmell of the Wine, he expreſſes it thus, *One fears this, leſt by taſting Wine he ſhould ſmell of Chriſts Blood.*

(*k*) *Epiſt.* 63. Hoc quis veretur, ne per ſaporem vini redoleat ſanguinem Chriſti.

S. *Jerome* has ſuch another ſaying, which cannot well be miſtaken to expreſs any other ſenſe but ours, when ſpeaking of Virgins (*l*) that were reproved for drinking Wine to exceſs, he ſays, *they made this excuſe*, (*joining ſacrilege to their drunkenneſs*) *and ſaid God forbid that I ſhould abſtain from the Blood of Chriſt.*

(*l*) *Epiſt. ad Euſtochium.* Ebrietati ſacrilegium copulantes aiunt, abſit ut ego me abſtineam à ſanguine Chriſti.

Either they ſaid nothing to the purpoſe, or they took that which they called *the Blood of Chriſt*, for Wine properly.

Thus alſo S. *Chryſoſtome* (*m*) ſpeaking of the rudeneſs of the Souldiers in the Church, ſays, that in the tumult, *the moſt holy Blood of Chriſt was ſhed upon the Souldiers Cloths.* Which could be nothing but Sacramental Wine.

(*m*) *Epiſt.* 1. *ad Innocent.* Τὸ ἁγιώτατον αἷμα χεῖται εἰς τὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἱμάτια ὑζεχύθη.

Leo the Great, ſpeaking of the *Manichees*, that for fear of the Laws came to the Communion of the *Catholicks*, and directing how to diſcover them, he ſays (*n*), *They ſo behave themſelves in the Communion of the Sacraments, that they may ſometime be more ſafely concealed; with an unworthy mouth they take the Body of Chriſt, but altogether decline drinking the Blood of our redemption.*

(*n*) *Serm.* 4. *de Quadrageſ.* Ita in Sacramentorum communione ſe temperant, ut interdum tutiùs lateant; Ore indigno Chriſti Corpus accipiunt, ſanguinem autem redemptionis noſtræ haurire omninò declinant.

In the ſenſe both of *Leo* and the *Manichees*, the *Body* and *Blood* here muſt be taken figuratively; for ſuch bad men as they, in the ſenſe of the Antients, could not eat, or any way receive *Chriſt's Body* in a proper

proper ſenſe, but being underſtood of the Type of it, *viz.* of the Sacramental Bread, that they would receive; but not the Type of his Blood; *viz.* the Wine, becauſe, as S. *Auſtin* (*o*) obſerves, *they drink no Wine, ſaying, it is the Gall of the Prince of darkneſs.* They had no more prejudice againſt the Blood than the Body of Chriſt, only they took it to be Wine, which they abhorred.

(*o*) *De Hereſ.* 46. Vinum non bibunt, dicentes fel eſſe principum tenebrarum.

3. Obſerv. *The Fathers ſpeak of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt, with ſuch terms of reſtriction and diminution, which plainly tell us, that they underſtood it not of his ſubſtantial and natural Body, but in a figurative ſenſe.* Thus

Origen (*p*) ſays, That *Bread in the Euchariſt is made by Prayer a certain holy Body.*

(*p*) *Contr. Celſum l* 8. *p.* 399. *Edit. Cantabr.* Σῶμα ἅγιόν τι.

And S. *Auſtin* (*q*), *Chriſt took in his hands what the faithful underſtand, and* after a ſort, *carried himſelf when he ſaid,* This is my Body.

(*q*) *In Pſal.* 33. *conc.* 2. Accepit in manus quod norunt fideles & ipſe ſe portabat *quodammodo*, cùm diceret *hoc eſt Corpus meum.*

Bede (*r*) upon the ſame Pſalm, has the ſame term of reſtriction, *Chriſt* after a ſort, *was carried in his own hands.*

(*r*) *In Pſal.* 33. Chriſtus quodammodo ferebatur in manibus ſuis.

S. *Auſtin* elſewhere (*ſ*), *In a certain ſenſe, the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt is Chriſt's Body; and the Sacrament of the Blood of Chriſt, is Chriſt's Blood.* Juſt as at *Eaſter* we ſay, this day Chriſt roſe, becauſe it is a memorial of it.

(*ſ*) *Epiſt.* 23. *ad Bonifac.* Secundum quendam modum Sacramentum Corporis Chriſti, Corpus Chriſti eſt; Sacramentum ſanguinis Chriſti, ſanguis Chriſti eſt.

S. *Chryſoſtome* (*t*) ſays of the Conſecrated Bread, *That it has no longer the name of Bread* (tho' the nature of it remains) *but is counted worthy to be called the Lord's Body.*

(*t*) *Epiſt. ad Ceſarium.* Dignus habitus eſt Dominici Corporis appellatione.

Theodoret in like manner (*u*), *He honoured the viſible Symbols with the appellation of his Body and Blood.*

(*u*) *Dialog.* 1. Τὰ ὁρώμενα σύμβολα τῷ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος πρεσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν.

Facundus Hermian. (*x*) is moſt expreſs. *We call,* ſays he, *the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, which is in the Conſecrated Bread and Cup, his Body and Blood; not that properly the Bread is his Body, and the Cup his Blood,* &c.

(*x*) *In defenſ.* 3. *capit. l.* 5. — Non quod propriè Corpus ejus ſit panis, & poculum ſanguis, &c.

So alſo is S. *Chryſoſtome* (*y*) in another place; where he ſhows, that the word *Fleſh*, is not always taken for the φύσις σώματος, the nature and

(*y*) *In Gal.* 5. 17. *Vol.* 3. *Savil. p.* 755.

and substance of the Body (which is the only proper sense) and he gives other instances which are improper; as that *flesh* signifies *a depraved will.* And adds two other improper senses, in these words. *By the name of Flesh, the Scripture is wont also to call the mysteries*; he adds also, that it calls the *Church* so, when it calls it *the Body of Christ.*

Τὴν πονηρὰν προαίρεσιν.

Καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καλεῖν εἰώθη ἡ γραφή.

The very phrase of being *wont to call*, shows, that of which it is affirmed to be improperly so called, as the phrase of *being thought worthy of the name* (as we heard before) argues the name not properly to agree to it.

4. Observ. *The Fathers, knowing, that the Eucharist was not in a proper sense Christs Body, give us several reasons why it is called his Body.* But no body uses to give a reason why he calls a thing by its proper name. I shall not name all the reasons here, but reserve some to another place; when we consider the Sacrament, as a Sign, Figure, Type, Memorial, *&c.*

1. One reason they give is *from its likeness and resemblance*, either in respect of what it consists of, or from the likeness of its effects.

S. *Austin*'s saying is remarkable (*z*), *If the Sacraments had not a resemblance of those things of which they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all: But from this resemblance they take commonly the name even of the things themselves which they resemble.*

Bede also gives (*a*) the same reason in his Commentary on the *Romans.*

The Author of the Book of Sacraments under S. *Ambrose* his name, speaks thus. *Thou mayst say perhaps, I do not see the substance of Blood. Well, but it has its likeness. For as thou hast received the likeness of his death, so thou drinkest the likeness of his pretious Blood.*

S. *Cyprian* (*b*). *When Christ called Bread, made up of many united grains of Corn, his Body, he shewed the unity of Christian people whom he bore; and when he call'd Wine pressed out of many Grapes,*

(*z*) *Epist.* 23. Si Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum non haberent quarum Sacramenta sunt, omninò Sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerunq; etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.

(*a*) *In Cap.* 6. *Epist. ad Roman. Lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. Fortè dicis, speciem sanguinis non video. Sed habet similitudinem. Sicut enim mortis similitudinem sumpsisti, ita etiam similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis, *&c.*

(*b*) *Epist.* 76. *ad Magnum.* Quando Dominus Corpus suum panem vocat, de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum nostrum quem

portabat indicat adunatum : & quando ſanguinem ſuum vinum appellat de botris atq; acinis plurimis expreſſum atq; in unum coactum, gregem item noſtrum ſignificat commixtione adunatæ multitudinis copulatam.

and put together his Blood, he ſignified alſo the uniting of a multitude of the Chriſtian flock together.

So *Rabanus Maurus* (c). *Therefore our Lord commended his Body and Blood in thoſe things, which conſiſting of many Grains or Grapes, are brought together into one, whereby he might ſignify the unity of the Charity of Saints.*

(c) *De Inſtit. Cleric. c.* 31. Propterea Dominus noſter Corpus & ſanguinem ſuum in eis rebus commendavit, quæ ad unum aliquid rediguntur ex multis ſive granis ſive acinis, & Sanctorum Charitatis unitatem ſignificaret.

Others again from the likeneſs of its effects. Thus *Iſidore* of *Sevil* (d). *Bread, becauſe it ſtrengthens the Body, is therefore called the Body of Chriſt; and Wine, becauſe it produces Blood in the Fleſh, is therefore referred to the Blood of Chriſt.*

(d) *De Offic. Eccleſ. l.* 1. *cap.* 18. Panis quia confirmat Corpus, ideo Corpus Chriſti nuncupatur; vinum autem quia ſanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad ſanguinem Chriſti refertur.

The ſame reaſon is alſo given by *Rabanus Maurus*, in his Commentary upon the 26 Chap. of S. *Matthew*.

2 *Reaſon.* Another reaſon, why they call the Euchariſt Chriſts Body, is, *becauſe it ſupplies the place, is inſtead of it, is its repreſentative, its pledge and pawn.*

Tertullian (e). *His Body is reputed to be in the Bread,* This is my Body.

(e) *Lib.* 6. *de Orat.* Corpus ejus in pane cenſetur, *Hoc eſt corpus meum.*

S. *Auſtin* (f). *See how the ſigns are varied, Faith remaining the ſame. There* (in the Wilderneſs) *the rock was Chriſt, to us that which is placed on Gods Altar is Chriſt.*

(f) *Tract.* 45. *in Joan.* Videte, fide manente, ſigna variata. Ibi Petra Chriſtus, nobis Chriſtus quod in altari Dei ponitur.

Again elſewhere more fully (g). *All things intended to ſignify, ſeem in a ſort to ſuſtain the perſons of thoſe things which they ſignify, as the Apoſtle ſays,* The Rock was Chriſt, *becauſe that Rock of which this is ſpoken, did ſignify Chriſt.*

(g) *De Civit. Dei, l.* 18. *c.* 48. Quodammodo omnia ſignificantia videntur rerum quas ſignificant ſuſtinere perſonas, ſicut dictum eſt ab Apoſtolo, *Petra erat Chriſtus*, quoniam Petra illa de qua hoc dictum eſt, ſignificabat utiq; Chriſtum.

Cyril of *Jeruſalem* (h) ſays, *Wherefore with all aſſurance, let us receive it* (viz. The Bread and Wine) *as the Body and Blood of Chriſt*; for *in the type of Bread his Body is given thee, and in the type of Wine his Blood.*

(h) *Catech. Myſtag.* 4. — Ὡς σώματι καὶ αἵματι μεταλαμβανομένῳ Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, &c.

Proclus of *Conſtantinople* (i). *Inſtead of the Manger let us venerate the Altar; inſtead of the Infant*

(i) *Orat.* 18. — Ἀντὶ τῆς φάτνης σεβώμεθα τὸν θυσιαστήριον· ἀντὶ τοῦ βρέφους τὸν λογικὸν ἄρνα.

let

let us embrace the Bread *that is bleſſed by the Infant*, (*viz.* Chriſt.)

Victor Antiochen. (*k*) *When the Lord ſaid, this is my* Body, *this is my* Blood, *it was fit that they who ſet forth the* Bread, *ſhould, after giving of thanks, reckon it to be his* Body, *and partake of it, and account the Cup to be inſtead of his* Blood.

(*k*) *In Marc.* 14. *Citante Bulingero adv. Caſaub.*
Αὐτῆς τοῦτο νομίζειν.
Τὸ δὲ πλέον ἐν τάξει αἵματος ἡγεῖσθαι.

The Author of the Commentaries attributed to S. *Jerome* (*l*). *Chriſt left to us his laſt remembrance, juſt as if a perſon taking a Journey from home, ſhould leave ſome pledge to one whom he loves, that as oft as he look'd upon it, he might call to mind his kindneſſes and friendſhips.*

(*l*) *In* 1 *Cor.* 11. Ultimam nobis commemorationem ſive memoriam dereliquit, quemadmodum ſi quis peregrè proficiſcens, aliquod pignus ei quem diligit derelinquat, ut quotieſcunq; illud viderit, poſſit ejus beneficia & amicitias memorare.

So alſo *Amalarius* (*m*). *Chriſt bowing his head gave up the Ghoſt. The Prieſt bows himſelf, and commends to God the Father this which is offered as a Sacrifice in the place of Chriſt.*

(*m*) *De Offic. Eccleſ. l.* 3. *c.* 25. *Edit. Hiturgii, p.* 425. Chriſtus, inclinato capite, emiſit ſpiritum. Sacerdos inclinat ſe, & hoc quod *vice Chriſti* immolatum eſt, deo Patri commendat.

5. Obſerv. *That altho', for the Reaſons given, the Fathers call the Sacrament Chriſts* Body, *yet they plainly ſay, that what is diſtributed in the Euchariſt is without any life or ſenſe, which cannot be ſaid of Chriſts natural* Body.

Epiphanius (*n*). *We ſee what our Saviour took in his hands* (viz. Bread) *and having given thanks ſaid,* This is mine, and that; *and yet we ſee, that it is not equal to it nor like it, not to the incarnate Image, not to the inviſible Deity, not to the Lineaments of members; for this* (the Bread) *is of a round form, and inſenſible as to any power.*

(*n*) *In Ancorat.*
Τοῦτό μου δεῖ τοῦτο. —— οὐκ ἴσον ὄψει, οὐδὲ ὅμοιον, οὐ τῇ ἐνσάρκῳ εἰκόνι, οὐ τῇ ἀοράτῳ θεότητι, &c.
—— Στρογγυλοειδὲς καὶ ἀναίσθητον ὡς πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν.

Theophilus of *Alexandria* (*o*), diſcourſing againſt *Origen*, who did not believe that the H. Ghoſt did operate upon things inanimate, ſays, *He* (Origen) *do's not remember, that the myſtical waters in* Baptiſm *are conſecrated by the coming of the H. Ghoſt, and that the Lords* Bread, *whereby the* Body *of our Saviour is ſhown, and which we break for our ſanctification, and the H. Cup, which are all placed upon the Table of the Church, and are indeed*

(*o*) *Epiſt. Paſchal.* 2. Non recogitat aquas in Baptiſmate myſticas adventu Sp. Sancti conſecrari, panemq; Dominicum, quo Salvatoris Corpus oſtenditur, & quem frangimus in Sanctificationem noſtri, & S. calicem, quæ in menſa Eccleſiæ collocantur, & utique inanima ſunt, per invocationem & adventum Spiritûs S. ſanctificari.

indeed without life, yet are Sanctified by the Invocation and advent of the H. Ghost.

S. *Jerome* (p) commending the foresaid work, and admiring at the profit the Churches would reap thereby, says, *That they who are ignorant, being instructed by Scripture-Testimonies, may learn, with what veneration they ought to meddle with holy things, and serve at the Altar; and that the H. Chalices and H. Veils, and the rest of the things that appertain to the Celebration of our Lord's Passion, are not to be look'd upon as having no sanctity, as being without life and sense, but by reason that they accompany the* Body *and* Blood *of our Lord, are to be venerated with the same majestick regard, that his* Body *and* Blood *is.*

(p) *Epist. ad Theoph. Alex.* Ut discant qui ignorant eruditi testimoniis Scripturarum, qua debeant veneratione Sancta suscipere & Altaris servitio deservire; sacrosq; calices & sancta velamina, & cætera quæ ad cultum pertinent Dominicæ Passionis, non quasi inanima & sensu carentia Sanctimoniam non habere, sed ex *consortio corporis & sanguinis Domini*, eadem qua Corpus ejus & Sanguis Majestate veneranda.

6. Observ. *That the Fathers speak of Divisions and parts of the Eucharist, which cannot be truly said of the natural* Body *of Christ, which the Rom. Church confesses to be impassible, but only of the Sacramental* Bread *and Wine.*

Cyprian (q). *Another who was also defiled, the Sacrifice being Celebrated by the Priest, was so bold, as privily to take a part of it with others, but he could not eat and handle the Holy* (Body) *of the Lord.*

Clemens Alexandr. (r). *When the Bishop, according to custom had divided the Eucharist, they suffered every one of the people to take a portion of it.*

Origen (s) (if they be his genuine words) says, *When ye receive the Lords Body, ye keep it with all caution and veneration, lest any little portion of it should fall down, lest any thing of the consecrated gift should slip down to the ground,* &c.

S. *Basil* (t) showing, that they that have received the Communion in the Church may reserve it, and Communicate themselves at home with their own hand, and that the practice was thus in *Alexandria* and *Egypt*; adds, that *when the Priest has distributed the Sacrifice, he that receives*

(q) *Lib. de Lapsis.* Quidam alius & ipse maculatus, sacrificio à Sacerdote celebrato, partem cum cæteris ausus est latenter accipere, sanctum Domini edere & contrectare non potuit.

(r) *Strom. l.* 1. — Ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν.

(s) *Hom.* 13. *in Exodum.* Cùm suscipitis Corpus Domini, cum omni cautela & veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decidat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid dilabatur, *&c.*

(t) *Epist.* 289. *ad Cæsariam.*

ceives it whole, and takes daily a part of that which was ſo given him, ought to believe that he rightly receives it. —— *It is the ſame in virtue, whether a perſon receive a ſingle part from the Prieſt, or many parts together.*

Ταῦτὸν πίνων ἐςὶ τῷ δυνάμει ὧν τι μίαν μέρδα λίξαλαι τις ἐκ τῦ ἱερέως, εἴτε πολλὰς μερίδας ὅμα.

S. *Ambroſe* agrees with it, (*u*) ſpeaking of the Blood of Chriſt. *Whether thou takeſt*, ſays he, *a little, or drinkeſt a larger draught, there is the ſame perfect meaſure of redemption to all.*

(*u*) *Epiſt.* 1. *ad Juſtum.* Etſi parum ſumas, etſi plurimum hauriás, eadem perfecta eſt omnibus menſura redemptionis.

So alſo S. *Auſtin* (*x*) ſpeaking of that upon the Lords Table which is bleſſed and ſanctified, (which is Bread) he ſays of it, *that it is broken into little parts to be diſtributed.* Which cannot be ſaid of Chriſts proper Body.

(*x*) *Epiſt.* 59. *ad Paulin.* — Ad diſtribuendum comminuitur.

And elſwhere (*y*) his phraſe concerning communicating is, *to take a part from the body of the immaculate Lamb.*

(*y*) *Epiſt.* 86. *ad Caſulanum.* De agni immaculati corpore partem ſumere.

Alſo in another place, he ſays (*z*), *In receiving we know what we think. We receive a little portion, and are fatted at heart.*

(*z*) *De Verb. dom. ſerm.* 33. In accipiendo novimus quid cogitemus. Modicum accipimus & in corde ſaginamur.

Cyril of *Alexandria* (*a*) ſays, *The leaſt part of the Conſecrated Bread* (which he calls the *Eulogy*) *mingles the whole Body into it ſelf, and fills it with its own energy, and thus both Chriſt is in us, and we again are in him.*

(*a*) *In Joan.* 6. 57. Ὀλίγον μέρος εὐλογίας σύμπαν ἡμῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναχύρει τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὴν ἰδίας ἐνεργείας ἀναπληροῖ, ὥστε τε ἐν ἡμῖν γίνεσθαι Χριστὸν, καὶ ἡμᾶς αὖ πάλιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

Euſebius (*b*) tells the ſtory of the Presbyter, that when *Serapion* was a dying, *ſent him*, by a Boy, *a little bit of the Euchariſt.*

(*b*) *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* l. 6. c. 36. — Βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας.

And *Proſper* (*c*) has a like ſtory of a poſſeſſed Woman, *that received a ſhort and ſmall portion of our Lords Body.*

(*c*) *Dimidium temporis.* c. 6. — Brevem portiunculam Corporis Dominici.

And *P. Pius* I, in an Epiſtle attributed to him (and made uſe of by *Bellarmine* (*d*)) ſpeaks of *ſome of the Blood of Chriſt dropping and diſtilling on the ground*, and directs what is to be done in that caſe.

(*d*) *De Euchar.* l. 2. cap. 5. Si quid de ſanguine Domini ſtillaverit in terram.

7. Ob-

7. Obſerv. *The Fathers ſpeak of making the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, in a Senſe quite different from that of the Romaniſts.*

S. *Jerome* frequently uſes the phraſe of *making Chriſts Body*, and ſpeaking of the Presbyters that ſucceeded to the Apoſtles, in one Epiſtle (*e*) he ſays, *they make the Body of Chriſt with their Holy Mouth.*

(*e*) Epiſt. 1. *ad Heliodor.* Qui Chriſti Corpus Sacro ore conficiunt.

And in another Epiſtle (*f*) ſays of them, *That upon their Prayers the Body and Blood of Chriſt is made.*

(*f*) *Ad Evagrium.* Ad quorum preces Chriſti Corpus ſanguiſq; conficitur.

Alſo in a third Epiſtle (*g*) he deſcribes a Prieſt to be *one that mediates betwixt God and Men, and one that makes the fleſh of the Lamb with his holy mouth.*

(*g*) *Ad Fabiolam.* Sequeſter Dei & hominum, & carnes agni ſacro ore conficiens.

Here now they of the Church of *Rome* take care to advance the Prieſthood, tho' even with words of Blaſphemy. One crys out (*h*), *He that created me without me, is created by my means.*

(*h*) *Stella Clericorum.* Qui creavit me ſine me, creatur mediante me.

So alſo *Biel* (*i*). *He that created me (if I may be bold to ſay it) has given me power to create himſelf, and he that created me without me, is created by my means.*

(*i*) *In Canon. Miſſæ, Lect.* 4. Qui creavit me (ſi fas eſt dicere) dedit mihi creare ſe, & qui creavit me ſine me, creatur mediante me.

Biel alſo (in the ſame Lecture) makes a compariſon between the Prieſts and the Bl. Virgin, and makes them to carry it from her in this matter.

She by pronouncing eight words, Behold the Handmaid of the Lord, &c. Conceived once the Son of God and the Redeemer of the World. They (viz. the Prieſts) *being conſecrated by the Lord, by ſpeaking five words, do call the ſame Son of God, and the Virgin, bodily before them every day.* And then crys out. *Conſider, O Prieſts, in what high degree and dignity you are placed.*

Illa prolatis octo verbulis, Ecce Ancilla Domini, fiat mihi ſecundùm Verbum tuum, ſemel concepit Dei filium & mundi Redemptorem. Iſti à Domino conſecrati, quinq; Verbis eundem Dei Virginiſq; filium advocant quotidie corporaliter. Attendite, O Sacerdotes, in quo gradu & dignitate ſitis conſtituti.

But

But now the Fathers they ſufficiently explain themſelves, that this of *making Chriſts Body*, cannot be underſtood of the *natural* and *proper Body* of Chriſt. For

Firſt, They lay it down as a Rule, that *whatſoever is made, was not before it was made.*

Thus *Athenagoras* (*k*) ſays, *That which is already is not made, but that which is not.*

Tertullian in like manner ſays (*l*,) *Nothing that has a* fieri, *is without a beginning, but it begins to be while it begins to be made.*

Athanaſius (*m*). *It is the property of Creatures and works, that they are ſaid to exiſt out of non-entities, and not to be before they are made.*

Greg. Nyſſen (*n*). *If he made it, he made that which was not at all.*

S. *Hilary* (*o*). *Every thing that is made, was not before it was made.*

S. *Ambroſe* (*p*). *That which is made begins to be.*

S. *Auſtin* (*q*). *To make is true of that which was not at all.*

Cyril Alexand. (*r*). *It cannot be, that what already exiſts, ſhould be brought into being, but what do's not exiſt.*

Vigilius alſo (*s*). *To be made, is the uſual property of him, who never ſubſiſted before.*

Caſſianus alſo (*t*). *Things already ſprung up, cannot return into that ſtate; that they ſhould be generated by a new creation.*

Theſe ſayings do very ill accord with the Doctrine of the Roman Church (*u*), which teaches, that the Converſion in the Euchariſt is made, *without any change in our Lord; for neither is Chriſt generated, or is changed, or increaſed.*

(*k*) *De reſurrect.* Τὸ ὂν ὐ γίνεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ὄν.

(*l*) *Lib. contr. Hermog. cap.* 19. Nihil quod fieri habet ſine initio eſt, quin initium ſit illi dum incipit fieri.

(*m*) *Contr. Arian. Orat.* 3. Κτισμάτων καὶ ποιημάτων ἴδιον, τὸ λέγεσθαι ἐξ ὐκ ὄντων, καὶ ὐκ ἦν πρὶν γένηται.

(*n*) *Contr. Eunom. l.* 9. Εἰ ἐποίησε, τὸ μὴ ὂν πάντως ἐποίησε.

(*o*) *De Trin. l.* 12. Omne quod fit, antequam fiat non fuit.

(*p*) *De Incarn. l.* 3. Quod fit incipit.

(*q*) *De moribus Manich. c.* 7. Facere enim eſt quod omnino non erat.

(*r*) *Theſaur. Aſſert.* 20. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν δύνατο τὸ ἤδη ὂν εἰς τὸ εἶναι φέρεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ὄν.

(*s*) *Lib.* 3. *cont. Eutyches.* Fieri, ejus ſoleat eſſe proprium, qui nunquam ante ſubſiterat.

(*t*) *Lib.* 7. *de incarn. c.* 2. Quæ orta jam fuerint, redire in id rurſum non queant ut novâ creatione generentur.

(*u*) *Catechiſ. ad Parœch. de Euchariſt. n.* 39. Sine ulla Domini noſtri mutatione; neq; enim Chriſtus aut generatur, aut mutatur, aut augeſcit.

Secondly, They ſo ſpeak of *making Chriſts Body*, that it cannot be underſtood of any other than his typical and myſtical Body. For the Fathers ſay, That *Bread is made his Body.*

Tertullian

Tertullian (x). *Christ when he had taken Bread, and distributed it to his Disciples, made it his Body, saying,* This is my Body.

Eusebius (y). *Christ commanded his Disciples* (speaking of the Symbols of the Divine Oeconomy delivered to them, *i. e.* Bread and Wine) *to make the image of his Body.*

Cyril of Jerus. (z). *When the Invocation is over, the Bread is made the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ.*

Greg. Nyssen (a) says, *At first the Bread is common Bread, but after the mystery has consecrated it, it is called and is made the Body of Christ.*

S. *Austin* (b). *Not all* Bread, *but only that which receives Christ's blessing, is made the* Body *of Christ.*

Canon of the Mass. *Which Oblation, O Almighty God, we beseech thee vouchsafe to make blessed, allowable, firm, rational, and acceptable, that it may be made to us the* Body *and* Blood *of thy most dear Son our Lord Jesus Christ,* &c.

(x) *Cont. Marc. l. 4. c. 40.* Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis, Corpus suum illum fecit, *hoc est Corpus meum* dicendo.

(y) *Demonst. Evang. lib. 8.* Τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι.

(z) *Catech. Mystag. 1.* Ἐπικλήσεως γενομένης, ὁ μὲν ἄρτος γίνεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ὁ δὲ οἶνος αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

(a) *Orat. in Christi Baptisma.* Σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεταί τε καὶ γίνεται.

(b) *Serm. de diversis, 87.* Non omnis panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi, fit Corpus Christi.

Canon Missæ. Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus, quæsumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptamq; facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus & sanguis fiat dilectissimi tui filii Domini nostri J. Christi, *&c.*

Also the Fathers say still more expresly, that the Body and Blood of Christ, *is made of Bread and Wine.*

Thus the Author of the Book of Sacraments under S. *Ambrose*'s name (c). *Perhaps thou wilt say, My Bread is usual Bread: but tho' that Bread be Bread before the Sacramental words, yet upon Consecration, of Bread is made the Flesh of Christ.*

Gaudentius (d). *The Creator and Lord of nature himself, who produces Bread out of the Earth, of Bread again (seeing he is able, and has promised it) he makes his own Body; and he that of Water made Wine, made also of Wine his Blood.*

(c) *Lib. 4. de Sacram. c. 4.* Tu fortè dicis, meus panis est usitatus: sed panis iste panis est ante verba Sacramentorum, ubi accesserit consecratio *de pane fit caro Christi.*

(d) *In Exod. trac. 2.* Ipse naturarum Creator & Dominus, qui producit de terra panem, de pane rursus, qui potest & promisit, efficit proprium corpus, & qui de aqua vinum fecit, & de vino sanguinem suum.

Now all this can be meant of nothing else, but what we heard out of *Eusebius* before, of the *Image of his Body*, which he commanded his Disciples to make.

S. *Je-*

S. *Jerome* also explains it of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, upon those words of the Prophet (*e*), *They shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for Wheat, and for Wine and Oil.* He adds, *Of which the Lords Bread is made, and the type of his Blood is fulfilled, and the blessing of sanctification is shown.*

And in another place (*f*). *Of this Wheat the Bread that descended from Heaven is made, and which strengthens the heart of man.* Which must be understood of the Bread received in the Eucharist.

So *Tertullian* (*g*) explains himself. *He made Bread his Body,* saying, This is my Body, *That is, the Figure of my Body.*

And *Leo Magn.* (*h*). *Neither may the Presbyters, without the Bishops Command, make the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.*

S. *Chrysostom* (*i*) speaking of Wine, says, *By this the matter of the good things for our Salvation is perfected.* Where by those *good things*, he plainly means the Wine in the Eucharist.

It is also very observable, that the Fathers sometimes call this the *mystical Bread and Wine*, and sometimes the *mystical Body and Blood of Christ.*

Thus S. *Austin* (*k*) says, *Our Bread and Cup is made mystical to us, by a certain consecration, and does not grow so.*

S. *Chrysostom* (*l*) thus. *The mystical Body and Blood is not made without the grace of the spirit.*

When S. *Ambrose* (*m*) had said, *This Body which we make is of the Virgin.* He explains this phrase by another before it, *viz. That Sacrament which thou receivest is made by the Word of Christ.* And also by another saying of his that follows. *It was true Flesh of Christ that was Crucified and buried; it is therefore truly the Sacrament of his Flesh.* Where you see he distinguishes these two, the Flesh of Christ Crucified, and that in the Sacrament, which is only mystically so.

(*e*) *In Jerem.* 31. 12. De quo conficitur panis Domini, & sanguinis ejus impletur typus, & benedictio Sanctificationis ostenditur.

(*f*) *In cap.* 9. *Zachar.* De hoc tritico efficitur ille panis qui de Cœlo descendit & confortat cor hominis.

(*g*) *Antea citat.* Corpus suum illum (sc. panem) fecit, hoc est Corpus meum dicendo, id est, Figura Corporis mei.

(*h*) *Epist.* 88. Nec licet Presbyteris nisi eo (sc. Episcopo) jubente, Sacramentum Corporis & sanguinis Christi conficere.

(*i*) *Hom.* 29. *in Genes.* Ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν τῶν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τούτου τελεῖται.

(*k*) *Contr. Faust. l.* 20. *c.* 13. Noster panis & calix certâ consecratione, mysticus fit nobis, non nascitur.

(*l*) *De resurrect. mort. Hom.* 33. Σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μυστικὸν οὐκ ἄν ποτε γένοιτο τῆς πνεύματος χάριτος χώρις.

(*m*) *Lib. de iis qui initiant. c.* 9. Hoc quod conficimus Corpus ex Virgine est.

Sacramentum illud quod accipis sermone Christi conficitur.

Vera utiq; caro Christi quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est. Verè ergo carnis illius Sacramentum est.

Heſychius (n) ſpeaking of Jews, Pagans, and Hereticks, ſays, that *the Soul in Society with them may not eat of the myſtical Body*, that is, of the Euchariſt.

(n) *In Levit. lib. 6.* -- Corpore myſtico non veſcetur.

And elſewhere (o) ſpeaking of the Cup in the Sacrament, uſes this phraſe, *Chriſt drinking himſelf and giving to the Apoſtles the intelligible Blood to drink.* Where *intelligible Blood* is the *myſtical Blood* in the Euchariſt, according to his conſtant uſe of that word.

(o) *Id. ibid. lib. 2.* Chriſtus bibens ipſe, & Apoſtolis bibere dans ſanguinem intelligibilem.

Procopius of *Gaza* (p) upon thoſe words of the Prophet, of Gods *taking away the Staff of Bread* and *ſtay of Water*; and telling us, that Chriſts Fleſh is meat indeed, and his Blood drink indeed, which they that have not, have not *the ſtrength of Bread and Water*; he adds, *there is another enlivening Bread alſo taken from the Jews*, &c. where he means *the Euchariſt*, diſtinguiſhing it from Chriſts proper Fleſh and Blood.

(p) *In Eſa.* cap. 3.

Καὶ ἄλλος δὲ ἄρτος ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀφήρηται ὁ ζωοποιὸς ἄρτος.

S. *Ambroſe* (q) makes the ſame diſtinction, where ſpeaking of the Benediction of *Aſſer*, that *his Bread was fat*, &c. and that *Aſſer* ſignifies *riches*; he adds, *Jeſus gave this Bread to the Apoſtles, that they ſhould divide it among believing people, and he now gives it to us, being that which the Prieſt daily Conſecrates with his words. This Bread is made the food of Saints. We may alſo underſtand thereby the Lord himſelf, who gave his Fleſh to us, as he ſays,* I am the Bread of Life.

(q) *De benedict. Patriarch. c.* 9. Hunc panem dedit (*Jeſus*) Apoſtolis, ut dividerent populo credentium, hodieq; dat nobis eum, quem ipſe quotidie ſacerdos conſecrat ſuis verbis: Hic panis factus eſt eſca Sanctorum. Poſſumus & ipſum Dominum accipere, qui carnem ſuam nobis dedit, ſicut ipſe ait, *Ego ſum panis vita.*

What can be more clear, than that he diſtinguiſhes here between the Euchariſtical Bread (which he calls the Saints food) and Chriſt himſelf the Bread of Life?

8. Obſerv. *The Fathers ſpeak of Chriſt's Body ſanctified and ſacrificed in the Euchariſt; which cannot be underſtood of any thing, but his repreſentative and Typical Body.*

S. *Auſtin* (r) ſpeaking of that *which is upon the Lords Table* (which the Church of *Rome* will have to be Chriſt's Natural Body) ſays, that *it is bleſſed and ſanctified.* And

(r) *Epiſt.* 59. Quod in Domini menſa eſt ——

— benedicitur & ſanctificatur.

And *Gaudentius* (*s*), ſpeaking of Chriſt, whom he compares to the Paſchal Lamb, ſays, *Through all the Houſes of the Churches, in the myſtery of Bread and Wine, being ſacrificed he refreſhes, being believed on he quickens, being conſecrated he ſanctifies them that conſecrate.*

(*s*) *In Exod. tract.* 19. Per ſingulas Eccleſiarum domos in myſterio panis & vini reficit immolatus, vivificat creditus, conſecrantes ſanctificat conſecratus.

This can be only true in *repreſentation*, which is ſaid of Chriſt's being *ſacrificed* and *ſanctified* (or conſecrated) by us; for the *proper* and *natural Body* of Chriſt can neither be *ſanctified* in a proper ſenſe, nor *ſacrificed* by us, as I ſhall now ſhow.

1. *Not ſanctified properly.*

For this in the ſenſe of the Fathers, is *Dedication to God*; and tho' we may dedicate *our ſelves* to God, yet not the *Son of God* to him.

Origen (*t*). *To ſanctify a thing, that is, to vow it to God.*

(*t*) *In Levit. hom.* 11. Sanctificare aliquid, hoc eſt, vovere Deo.

Cyril Alexandr. (*u*). *That which is ſaid to be ſanctified do's not partake of all holineſs, but it rather ſignifies that which is devoted to God in honour of him.* Now Chriſt is certainly partaker of all Holineſs.

(*u*) *Com. in Eſaiam. Edit. gr. lat. p.* 178. Τὸ ἁγιάζεσθαι λεγόμενον, οὐχὶ παντὸς ἁγιασμοῦ μέτοχον ἴσχει, σημαίνει δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ εἰς δόξαν ἀναθεωμένον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Jobius (***). *We ſay a place, or Bread, or Wine is ſanctified, which are ſet apart for God, and are not put to any common uſe.*

* *Apud Photium*, cod. 222. Ἁγιάζεσθαι τὸν τόπον, ἢ τὸν ἄρτον, ἢ τὸν οἶνον, ἃ τῷ θεῷ φαμὲν ἀφορίζεσθαι καὶ πρὸς μηδεμίαν χρῆσιν ὑποφέρεσθαι κοινήν.

Heſychius (*x*). *That which is ſanctified and offered, becauſe it is offered it begins to be ſanctified, therefore that it was not holy before.* This cannot be affirmed of Chriſts proper Body, which was never other than holy, but may of the *Typical Bread* which was common before.

(*x*) *In Levit. l.* 7. Quod ſanctificatur & offertur, eo quod offertur Sanctificari incipit, ergo prius non erat ſanctum.

2. *Not ſacrificed properly.*

Therefore *Gaudentius* (*y*) in the forecited Tract, ſays, *We offer the Labours*, &c. *Of the Paſſion, in the Figure of the Body and Blood.*

(*y*) *In Exod. tract.* 19. Labores Paſſionis, *&c.* in figura corporis & ſanguinis offerimus.

S. *Auſtin* (*z*). *Was not Chriſt offered once in himſelf, and yet every day in the Sacrament he is offered for the people?*

(*z*) *Epiſt.* 23. *ad Bonifac.* Nonne ſemel immolatus eſt Chriſtus in ſeipſo, & tamen in Sacramento omni die populis immolatur?

He opposes, you see these two, to be Sacrificed in himself, (and that is but once) and to be offered in the Sacrament, and that may be every day.

Also elsewhere (*a*). *Does Christ die so often as Easter is celebrated? Yet this Anniversary remembrance, do's as it were represent what was done of old, and so admonishes us as if we saw our Lord hanging on the Cross.*

And in the second Exposition it self, he says (*b*). *He gave us his Supper, and he gave us his Passion, viz.* By *representation.*

S. *Chrysostom* (*c*) says the same; *The mystery* (*viz.* the Eucharist) *is the Passion and the Cross.*

Which he explains thus elsewhere (*d*). *We always offer the same Sacrifice, or rather make a remembrance of* (his) *Sacrifice.*

So *Eulogius* of *Alexandria* (*e*), speaking of the tremendous mystery of Christs Body, says, *It is not the offering of different Sacrifices, but the remembrance of that one Sacrifice once offered.*

Theodoret also fully (*f*) tells us, That it is manifest to those that are skill'd in divine matters, that *we do not offer any other Sacrifice, but make a remembrance of that one saving one.*

S. *Austin*'s words are also remarkable (*g*.) To eat Bread in *the N. Testament is the Sacrifice of Christians.*

Eusebius (*h*) speaking of Christ's Sacrifice offered for our Salvation, adds. *He commanded us to offer to God continually the remembrance instead of the Sacrifice.* What can be more plain?

S. *Ambrose* says (*i*) that Christ is offered here, but it is (in imagine) *in an image*, and he opposes this to his offering himself (in veritate) *in truth.*

S. *Austin* (*k*) says, *Our Priest who offered himself an holocaust for our sins, also commended the similitude of his Sacrifice to be celebrated in memory of his passion.*

(*a*) *In Psal.* 21. *Præfat. in secundam expos.* Quotiens Pascha celebratur, nunquid totiens Christus moritur? Sed tamen anniversaria recordatio, quasi repræsentat quod olim factum est, & sic nos facit moneri tanquam videamus in cruce pendentem Dominum.

(*b*) *In secunda expos. Psal.* 21. Cœnam suam dedit, Passionem suam dedit.

(*c*) *Hom.* 83. *in Matth.* Μυστήριον ἐστὶ τὸ πάθος καὶ ὁ σταυρός.

(*d*) *Hom.* 17. *in Epist. ad Hebr.* Τὴν αὐτὴν (θυσίαν) ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

(*e*) *Apud Photium cod.* 280. Οὐ θυσίων ἐστὶ διαφόρων προσαγωγὴ, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἅπαξ προενηνεγμένης θυσίας ἀνάμνησις.

(*f*) *In Epist. ad Hebr.* 8. 4. Ὡς οὐκ ἄλλην τινὰ θυσίαν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μίας ἐκείνης καὶ σωτηρίου τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελεῖν.

(*g*) *De civit. Dei, l.* 17. *cap.* 5. *in fine.* Manducare panem in N. Testamento est Sacrificium Christianorum.

(*h*) *Demonstr. Evan. l.* 1. *c.* 10. Μνήμην δὲ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ θεῷ διενεγκῶς προσφέρειν.

(*i*) *De Offic.* l. 1. cap. 48.

(*k*) *Quæstion* 83. *quæst.* 61 Ipse etiam Sacerdos noster qui seipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, & ejus Sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suæ Passionis memoriam commendavit.

And

And elſewhere (*l*). *The Fleſh and Blood of this Sacrifice --- after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, is celebrated by the Sacrament of remembrance.*

Laſtly, *Fulgentius* (*m*) calls the Sacrifice, which the H. Catholick Church ceaſes not to offer through the whole World, *the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine*; and ſays, that in this Sacrifice, *there is a thankſgiving and a commemoration of the Fleſh of Chriſt which he offered for us.*

For want of apprehending things thus, they of the Church of *Rome* are tempted to utter words bordering upon Blaſphemy; and with *Corn. à Lapide*, * to make their *Sacrificing Prieſt* greater than Chriſt the *Sacrifice.*

(*l*) *Contr. Fauſtum*, l. 20. c. 21. Hujus Sacrificii caro & ſanguis — Poſt aſcenſum Chriſti per *Sacramentum memoriæ* celebratur.

(*m*) *De fide ad Petrum*, c. 16. Sacrificium panis & vini. —— Gratiarum actio atq; commemoratio eſt carnis Chriſti quam pro nobis obtulit.

* *Comm. in Heb.* 7. *v.* 7. Adde Sacerdotem quatenus gerit perſonam Chriſti Sacrificantis, quodam modo majorem eſſe Chriſto ipſo ſacrificato. In omni enim Sacrificio ſacerdos major eſt ſua victima quam offert.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Eighth Difference.

The Church of Rome *in all Sayings of the Fathers that mention a Change and Converſion in the Euchariſt, underſtand it of ſuch a Change as aboliſhes the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, the Accidents only remaining: But the Fathers never uſe theſe Phraſes in this Senſe.*

IT is acknowledged by us, That the Fathers ſpeak frequently of a Change of the Bread and Wine, and their paſſing into, and being converted into Chriſt's Body and Blood. It is needleſs therefore to cite their Teſtimonies to this purpoſe; but I ſhall evidently prove, that they do not underſtand this *Change* and *Converſion* in the Senſe of Tranſubſtantiation.

To give ſome Order to their Teſtimonies, I ſhall not cite them in a heap, but as Proofs of ſeveral Aſſertions of theirs, which overthrow the Change by Tranſubſtantiation.

1 *Aſſertion. The Fathers make a difference betwixt the Change or Converſion of a Thing, and its Abolition.* When they *affirm* the one, they at the ſame time *deny* the other. But Tranſubſtantiation ſuppoſes the Elements, as to the Matter and Subſtance of them, to periſh and to be deſtroyed, when they are ſaid to be changed.

You cannot well imagine that the *Fathers*, if they thought of Miracles wrought in the Sacrament, yet ſhould ever dream of any ſuch as had no agreement with all the Miracles that God ever wrought before. They well knew, (and our Adverſaries do not deny it) that in all other Supernatural Changes, there was only the introducing of a new Form, the *Materia ſubſtrata* (the common Matter) remaining. So it was when *Moſes*'s Rod was turned into a Serpent, when the Waters were turned into Blood, *Lot*'s Wife into a Pillar of Salt, the Wine in *Cana* of *Galilee* changed into Water; in all theſe, neither the old Matter was loſt, nor new Matter created. The *Fathers* therefore laugh at any ſuch Change where the Things changed utterly periſh.

Tertullian

Tertullian (*n*) charges it as a great Abſurdity againſt the *Marcionites*, that, according to them, *To be changed, was to periſh wholly, and as to what they were before.*

(*n*) *De Reſurrect. Carn. c.* 55. Quaſi demutari, ſit in totum & de priſtino perire.

He has many ſmart Sayings againſt them, for denying the ſame Bodies to appear and riſe at the Reſurrection; and urges that of 1 *Cor.* 15. ſhewing that there will be a Change, not a Deſtruction of our Fleſh. For, ſays he, *A Change is one thing, and Deſtruction is another. But it will periſh in the Change, if that Fleſh do not remain in the Change which ſhall be exhibited at the Reſurrection.*

Aliud eſt demutatio, aliud perditio. Peribit autem demutata, ſi non ipſa permanſerit in demutatione quæ exhibita fuerit in reſurrectione.

——*As therefore that which is deſtroyed, is not changed; ſo that which is changed, is not deſtroyed. For, to periſh, is wholly not to be what it had been; but to be changed, is to be otherwiſe than it was. Moreover, by being otherwiſe, the thing may ſtill be; for it has a Being which periſhes not; for it only ſuffered a Change, not a Deſtruction.*

—Quomodò ergo quod perditum eſt, mutatum non eſt, ita quod mutatum eſt perditum non eſt. Periſſe enim, eſt in totum non eſſe quod fuerit; mutatum eſſe, aliter eſſe eſt. Sed porrò dum aliter eſt, id ipſum poteſt eſſe; habet enim eſſe quod non perit; mutationem enim paſſum eſt, non perditionem.

Gelaſius (*o*) alſo diſputing againſt the *Eutychians*, who thought that the Humanity was converted into the Divinity, ſo that nothing of the other remained, (juſt as with them the Bread is converted into Chriſt's Body, nothing of its Subſtance remaining) ſays thus: *Neither do's our Condition by the Union of the Deity ſeem to be glorified, but rather to be conſumed, if it do's not ſubſiſt the ſame in Glory, but the Deity exiſting alone, the Humanity now ceaſes to be there, &c.*

(*o*) *De duabus Naturis.*

Nec videatur glorificata noſtra conditio unione Deitatis, ſed potius eſſe conſumpta, ſi non eadem ſubſiſtit in gloria, ſed ſolâ exiſtente Deitate, humanitas illic eſſe jam deſtitit, *&c.*

——*By this way, it will not be found to be ſublimated, but aboliſh'd.*

—Per hoc non ſublimata, ſed abolita potius invenitur.

The thing is ſo clear againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that *Scotus* (*p*) confeſſes it. *I ſay, properly ſpeaking, That Tranſubſtantiation is not a Change.*

(*p*) *In* 4. *diſt.* 11. *art.* 1. *ſec. ad propoſitum.* Dico proprie loquendo, quod tranſubſtantiatio non eſt mutatio.

2 *Aſſertion. When the Fathers ſpeak of converting a thing into another thing that was before, they ſuppoſe an Acceſſion and an Augmentation made to that, into which the Converſion is made.* Juſt as it is in Nouriſhment of our Bodies, the Food converted into them, makes an Increaſe of them.

Cyril

(q) *Epist. 1. ad Succensum.*

Κατηγορεύομεν τ̃ Θεότητος ὡς γενητῆς καὶ ὡς προσλαβούσης τι ἐν ἑαυτῇ, ὃ μὴ ἔστι κατὰ φύσιν ἴδιον αὐτῆς.

Ἀμήχανον.

(r) *De duabus Naturis.*—— Accesserit, accreveritque Deitati.

—— transfusione humanitatis adjectæ velut aucta videatur.

(s) *Epist. ad Zachariam, & in Hom. de Corp. & Sang. Domini.*

——Πολλῷ μᾶλλον διὰ τ̃ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τ̃ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος εἰς ἐπαύξησιν τ̃ σώματος τ̃ Χριστοῦ, γίνεται ἓν σῶμα, καὶ οὐ δύο.

(t) *In cap. 6. Joan.*

Ἐπιφοιτήσεως τ̃ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

Συνεξομοιοῦτο καὶ εἰς αὔξησιν καὶ σύστασιν συνεβάλλετο κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· καὶ νῦν οὖν ὁ ἄρτος εἰς σάρκα τ̃ κυρίου μεταβάλλεται.

Cyril. of Alexandr. (q) arguing against those Hereticks who thought the glorified Body of Christ was converted into his Divinity, he says, *Thus we derogate from the Divinity, as if it were made, and as receiving something into it self, which is not proper to its Nature.* And he makes this Conversion to be *impossible* upon this account.

Gelasius (r) uses the same Phrases, of *Accession* and *Increase to the Deity*, and that *by the transfusion of the Humanity added to it, the Divinity would seem to be increased.*

Thus the later *Greeks* thought it was in *Christ's* Body, into which the Bread was changed.

Damascen (s), speaking of the Body of Christ which we partake of: *I declare*, says he, *it cannot be said, there are two Bodies of Jesus Christ, there being but one alone. For, as the Child, as soon as it is born, is compleat, but receives his growth from eating and drinking; and tho' he grows thereby, yet cannot be said to have two Bodies, but only one; so, by greater reason, the Bread and Wine, by the Descent of the Holy Spirit, are made one only Body, and not two, by the Augmentation of the Body of Christ.*

Theophylact (t) expresses it thus: *The Bread is changed* (μεταποιεῖται) *into the Flesh of Christ by the ineffable Words, the mystical Benediction, and coming of the Holy Spirit upon it. No Man ought to be troubled in being obliged to believe that Bread becomes Flesh: For when our Lord was conversant in Flesh, and received his Nourishment from Bread, this Bread he did eat was changed into his Body,* being made like *to his holy Flesh, and contributed to augment and sustain it after a humane manner: And thus now is the Bread changed into our Lord's Flesh.*

See more Testimonies of the following *Greeks* in Monsieur *Claude's Catholick Doctrine of the* Eucharist, in answer to Monsieur *Arnaud, Lib. 3. cap. 13. pag. 228, 229. in Fol.*

3 *Assertion,*

3 *Aſſertion*, (and the moſt remarkable) is this. *The Fathers uſe the ſame Terms of paſſing into, being changed, converted, becoming another thing, &c. in other Caſes beſides the Euchariſt, wherein all agree there is no Change of Subſtances made.* Therefore there is no Argument can be drawn from ſuch Expreſſions in favour of Tranſubſtantiation, no not when the Word *Nature* or *Subſtance* is expreſt in the Change.

Tertullian (*u*) has daſhed this out of countenance, when he ſays to *Marcion*, *If thou defendeſt a Transfiguration and Converſion as far as the paſſing of the Subſtance of a thing into another, then* Saul, *who was turned into another Man, went out of his Body, &c.*

(*u*) *De Reſur. Carn. c.* 55. Si transfigurationem & converſionem in tranſitum ſubſtantiæ cujuſque defendis, ergo & *Saul* in alium virum converſus de corpore ſuo exceſſit, &c.

——Again, *It's poſſible to be changed*, ſays he, *to be converted and reformed into what ſhall happen at the Reſurrection, and yet the Subſtance be preſerved.*

Ibid. Ita & in reſurrectionis eventum mutari, converti, reformari licebit, cum ſalute ſubſtantiæ.

But this will more fully appear, by the Axioms the Fathers lay down, and by the Inſtances they give.

Their Axioms are ſuch as theſe.

Cyril. of Alexandr. (*x*). *For a thing to be made, do's not always ſignifie a change of Nature.*

(*x*) *Theſaur. Aſſert.* 20. Τὸ γίνεσθαι ὐ πάντως φύσεως σημαίνει μεταβολήν.

Cyril. of Jeruſ. (*y*). *Whatſoever the Holy Spirit touches, that is always ſanctified and changed.*

(*y*) *Catech. Myſtag.* 5. Πάντως γὰρ ὃ ἂν ἁγιάσῃ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦτο ἁγιάζεται, καὶ μεταβάλλεται.

S. Jerome (*z*). *By the Fire of the Holy Spirit, all that we think, ſpeak, and act, are changed into a Spiritual Subſtance.*

(*z*) *In cap.* 43. *Ezekiel.* Per ignem Spiritus ſancti omnia quæ cogitamus, loquimur ac facimus in ſpiritualem ſubſtantiam convertuntur.

If theſe Sayings be ſtrictly ſcann'd, they will amount to no more than a producing new Vertues and Qualities, which were not before.

Their Inſtances alſo ſhew the ſame.

1. *Of Miraculous Changes in Nature.*

S. Ambroſe (*a*). *Let them learn, that Nature may be converted, when the Rock flowed out Waters, and Iron ſwam above Water.*

(*a*) *In Hexem. l.* 3. *c.* 2. Diſcant naturam poſſe converti, quando petra aquas fluxit, & ferrum aquæ ſupernatavit.

Again (*b*), ſpeaking of Changes in the *Red Sea* and *Jordan*, when the Waters ſtood on an heap; *Is it not clear*, ſays he, *that the Nature of the Sea-waves and the Rivers Current was changed?*——Moſes *threw Wood into the Water, and the Nature of the Waters loſt its Bitterneſs.*——Eliſha *alſo threw Wood into the Water, and Iron ſwam; and this we know was done beſides Nature.*

Epiphanius (*c*) ſays, *The Hand of* Moſes *was changed into Snow.*

S. *Chryſoſtome* (*d*) (ſpeaking of the *Babylonian* Furnace) ſays, *The Elements forgetting their proper Nature, were changed to become profitable to them; and the very Beaſts were no longer Beaſts, nor the Furnace a Furnace.*

(*b*) *Lib. de iis qui initiant. c.* 9. Nonne claret naturam vel maritimorum fluctuum vel fluvialis curſus eſſe mutatam?—— Miſit Moyſes lignum in aquam & amaritudinem ſuam aquarum natura depoſuit.——Miſit etiam Eliſæus lignum in aquam, & ferrum natavit; utique & hoc præter naturam factum eſſe cognoſcimus.

(*c*) *Hæreſ.* 64. Εἰς χεῖρα μεταβάλλων.

(*d*) *In Pſal.* 10. Τὰ στοιχεῖα τὴν οἰκείαν ἀγνοήσαντα φύσιν πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον ἐκείνοις μεταβάλλοντος, καὶ τὰ θηρία οὐκ ἔτι θηρία ὄντα λοιπὸν, οὐδὲ ἡ κάμινος κάμινος.

2. *Of the Change by the Fall.*

S. *Auſtin* ſays (*e*), *By Sin Man fell from the Subſtance in which he was made.*

(*e*) *In Pſal.* 68. *Conc.* 1. Per iniquitatem homo lapſus eſt à ſubſtantiâ in qua factus eſt.

3. *Of the Change by Regeneration.*

Gr. Nyſſen (*f*) ſays, That by the Diſcipline of Chriſt *Men are changed into a Nature that is more Divine.*

And again (*g*). *Having diveſted themſelves of Fleſh and Blood, and being changed into a Spiritual Nature.*

Macarius (*h*) ſays, *Our Souls muſt be altered and changed from their preſent Condition, into another Condition, and into a Divine Nature.*

Cyril of Alexandria (*i*) ſpeaks of Regeneration as that which *tranſmutes and changes us into the Son of God.*

(*f*) *In Cantic. Hom.* 1. Μεταπλάττων τῇ φύσει πρὸς τὸ θειότερον.

(*g*) *In Cantic. Hom.* 9. Ἔξω γεγονότες σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, εἰς ὃ ἦ πνευματικὸν μεταστοιχειωθέντες φύσιν.

(*h*) *Hom.* 44. Δεῖ ἀλλαγῆναι καὶ μεταβληθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τωῦ κτίσεως εἰς ἑτέραν κτίσιν καὶ φύσιν θείαν.

(*i*) *De S. Trin. Dial.* 3. Μεταστοιχεῖοι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν.

4. *Of the Change in the Incarnation of Chriſt, and the Reſurrection.*

Gr. Nyſſen (*k*), ſpeaking of Chriſt, whom he calls our Firſt-fruits, ſays, That *by his mixing with God, he is changed into a Divine Nature.*

(*k*) *Contr. Eunom. l.* 2. Διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸ Θεῖον ἀναμείξεως εἰς θείαν φύσιν μεταπλάσεως.

And

And again (*l*) he uſes this Phraſe of Chriſt's Fleſh, That *this is alſo changed into the Deity.*

Chryſologus (*m*) of the Incarnation; *God is changed into Man.*

The Author under the Name of *Euſebius Emiſſenus* (*n*) asks, *What is the Rod turned into a Serpent?* He anſwers, *God changed into Man.*

Tertullian (*o*), ſpeaking of the Reſurrection; *We ſhall be changed in a moment into an Angelical Subſtance.*

S. *Hilary's* (*p*) Phraſe of it is, *A Change of Earthly Bodies into a Spiritual and Ethereal Nature.*

Macarius (*q*) ſpeaking of the Saints; *They are all changed into a Divine Nature.*

Chryſologus (*r*), ſpeaking of Chriſt; *Let him come, let him come, to repair our Fleſh, make our Souls new, change our Nature into a Celeſtial Subſtance.*

Cyril of Alexand. ſays (*s*) At the Reſurrection there will be *another kind of Life, and a Change of our very Nature.*

S. *Auſtin* (*t*) ſays, *Our mortal Fleſh is converted into the Body of an Angel.*—— *He that could change Water into Wine, is able to change Hay* (ſo he calls our Bodies that are Graſs) *into Gold, and of Fleſh make an Angel. If he made of Filth a Man, can he not make of Man an Angel?*

And elſewhere (*u*), ſpeaking of our Bodies; *When it ſhall put on Incorruption and Immortality, now it will be no longer Fleſh and Blood, but be changed into a celeſtial Body.*

Caſſian. (*x*) (ſpeaking of Chriſt's Fleſh after the Reſurrection;) *The Nature of his Fleſh is changed into a ſpiritual Subſtance.*

(*l*) *Ibid. l.* 5. Μεταποιηθῆναι καὶ ταύτην εἰς τὴν θεότητα.

(*m*) *Serm.* 45. Deus in hominem convertitur.

(*n*) *Hom. de Paſch.* 3. Quid eſt Virga in Serpentem? Deus in hominem commutatus.

(*o*) Demutati in atomo erimus in Angelicam ſubſtantiam. *Contr. Marc. l.* 3. *c. ult.*

(*p*) *In Pſal.* 138. Demutatio terrenorum corporum in ſpiritualem æthereamque naturam.

(*q*) *Hom.* 34. Εἰς θεϊκὴν φύσιν ἅπαντες μεταβάλλονται.

(*r*) *Serm.* 45. Veniat, veniat ut carnem reparet, animam innovet, ipſam naturam in cœleſtem commutet ſubſtantiam.

(*s*) *Orat. in Reſurr. Chriſti.* Ἀλλὰ ζωὴ ἔσται καὶ αὐτῇ ἡ φύσεως ἡμῶν μεταστοιχείωσις.

(*t*) *Serm.* 12. *de* 40. *ad Sirmond. Edit.* Caro mortalis convertitur in corpus Angeli.—— Ille qui potens fuit mutare aquam in vinum, potens eſt mutare fœnum in aurum, & de carne facere Angelum. Si de ſordibus fecit hominem, de homine non faciet Angelum?

(*u*) *Cont. Adimant. c.* 12. Cùm induerit incorruptionem & immortalitatem, jam non caro & ſanguis erit, ſed in corpus cœleſte mutabitur.

(*x*) *De Incarn. l.* 3. *c.* 3. Natura carnis in ſpiritualem eſt tranſlata ſubſtantiam.

5. *Of the Change in Baptiſm.*

S *Chryſoſtome* (*y*). *Verily the Power of Baptiſm is great,* &c. *it do's not ſuffer Man to be* any longer *Man.*

(*y*) *In Acta, Hom.* 23. Οὕτως μεγάλη ἡ βαπτίσματος ἡ δύναμις, ὥστε μὴ ἐάσαι ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ἀνθρώπους.

(z) *Orat.* 40. Χριστὸν μεταποιοῦμαι τῷ βαπτίσματι.

(a) *In Joan.* 3. 5. Διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐνεργείας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν καὶ ἄρρητον ἀναστοιχεῖται δύναμιν.

(b) *Idem Epiſt. ad Letorum.* Ἐκ παλιγγενεσίας μεταποιούμενοι διὰ τῆς λούτρου χάριτος.

(c) *Cont. Creſcon. lib.* 4. *c.* 54. Uno die tria, alio quinque millia credentium in ſuum corpus converſa ſuſcepit.

(d) *In Joan. tract.* 11. Unde rubet Baptiſmus niſi ſanguine Chriſti conſecratus?

(e) *Serm.* 14. *de Paſſione.* Suſceptus à Chriſto, & Chriſtum ſuſcipiens, non idem eſt poſt Lavacrum qui ante baptiſmum fuit, ſed corpus regenerati fit caro crucifixi; hæc commutatio dextræ eſt excelſi, &c.

(f) *De Nativ. Dom. Serm.* 4. Chriſtus dedit aquæ quod dedit matri: virtus enim altiſſimi & obumbratio Spiritus S. quæ fecit ut Maria pareret Salvatorem, eadem facit ut regeneret unda credentem.

Nazianzen (z). *I am changed into Chriſt in Baptiſm.*

Cyril of Alexandr. (a). *By the energy of the Spirit the ſenſible Water is changed into a kind of divine and unſpeakable Power.*

Again (b), That they are *tranſelemented by Regeneration, through the Grace of the Laver of Baptiſm.*

S. *Auſtin* (c), ſpeaking of Baptized Converts to Chriſtianity. *It received on one day Three, on another Five thouſand Believers converted into his Body.*

Again (d) elſewhere he asks, *How comes Baptiſm to be red, but by being conſecrated with the Blood of Chriſt?*

Leo the Great (e). *He that is received by Chriſt, and receives Chriſt, is not the ſame Man after as before Baptiſm; but the Body of the Regenerate Perſon becomes the Fleſh of Chriſt crucified; this is a Change by the Right Hand of the moſt High,* &c.

And again (f). *Chriſt gave to the Water, what he gave to his Mother: For the Virtue of the moſt High, and the Overſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt, which made* Mary *to bring forth a Saviour, the ſame makes the Water to regenerate a Believer.*

[Where we may alſo note by the way, That the mention of God's Omnipotence in the Caſe of Sacraments, do's not inter a ſubſtantial Change made there, ſince it do's not do it in *Baptiſm*; and yet the Omnipotency of God is ſeen in working Changes there.]

(g) *Ad Neoph. poſt Baptiſm. Serm.* 2. Aqua noſtra ſuſcipit mortuos & evomit vivos, ex animalibus veros homines factos, ex hominibus in Angelos tranſituros.

Zeno Veronenſ. (g). *Our Water receives the Dead and vomits forth the Living, being made true Men of meer Animals, ſuch as are to paſs from being Men into Angels,* &c. He ſays this of *Baptiſm*, which is not like common Water, which receives the Living to the bottom, and vomits forth the Dead.

Author

Author ſub nomine Euſebii Emiſſeni (*b*). *The Waters are ſuddenly changed, which are afterwards to change Men*, viz. that are baptized in them.

Again (*i*). *A Man by the Water of Baptiſm, tho' outwardly he ſeems the ſame, yet inwardly he is made another Man.——The Perſon is not touched, and Nature is changed.*

Again (*k*). *Nothing is added to what is outward, and he is wholly changed in what is inward.——He is changed by a native Whiteneſs into the Dignity of his firſt Original; and by the Water of Baptiſm, or by the Fire of the Holy Spirit, is made the Body of that eternal Bread.*

(*b*) *Hom.* 2. *de Epiphan.* Mutantur ſubitò aquæ, homines poſtmodum mutaturæ.

(*i*) *Id. Hom.* 3. *de Epiph.* Homo per aquam baptiſmi, licet à foris idem eſſe videatur intus tamen alter efficitur —— perſona non contingitur, & natura mutatur.

(*k*) *Idem Hom.* 5. *de Paſch.* In exteriore nihil additum eſt, & totum in interiore mutatum eſt.—— In illam primæ originis dignitatem nativo candore mutatur, ac per aquam Baptiſmi, vel per ignem Spiritus S. æterni illius panis corpus efficitur.

4 *Aſſertion. The Change in the Euchariſt which the Fathers ſo often mention, is either a Change into a Sacrament, or a Change of Efficacy and Virtue, by infuſion and addition of Grace.*

What can be plainer (as to the firſt) than that of *Iſidore* of *Sevil* (*l*)? Speaking of the Bread and Wine, he ſays, *Theſe two are viſible; but being ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, they paſs into a Sacrament of his divine Body.*

(*l*) *De Offic. Eccleſ. l.* 1. *c.* 18. Hæc duo ſunt viſibilia, ſanctificata autem per Spiritum S. in Sacramentum divini corporis tranſeunt.

As for the Change of *Virtue and Efficacy*, take theſe following Teſtimonies, among many others.

Theodotus (*m*). *The Bread and Oil are ſanctified by the Power of the Name, not being the ſame they were according to appearance when taken, but are changed powerfully into a Spiritual Virtue.* The like he ſays of the Water in Baptiſm, That it *not only retains the leſs* (that is, the Subſtance of Water) *but alſo has Sanctification added to it.*

(*m*) *Epitom. ad fin. Operum Clem. Alex.* Καὶ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἁγιάζεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὀνόματος, ἃ παρ' αὐτὰ ὄντα οἷα ἐλήφθη, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει εἰς δύναμιν πνευματικὴν μεταβέβληται. —— Οὐ μόνον ἔχει τὸ ὑγρόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἁγιασμὸν προστεθείκται.

Epiphanius alſo (*n*) ſpeaks the ſame. *Here in Chriſt the virtue of Bread and force of Water are ſtrengthned; not that the Bread is thus powerful to us, but the Virtue of the Bread* (which Chriſt puts into it). *For Bread is indeed an Aliment, but there is in it a Virtue to enliven us.*

(*n*) *In Compendio de Fide Eccleſ.* Ἐναῦθα ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ ἰσχὺς ἐνεργαποιεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος· ἵνα οὐκ ἄρτος ἡμῶν γένηται δύναμις, ἀλλὰ δύναμις ἄρτου, καὶ βρῶσις μὲν ὁ ἄρτος, ἡ δὲ δύναμις ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ζωοποίησιν.

Cyril of Alexandr. (o). *God condescending to our Infirmities, indues the Oblations set before us with a Virtue of Life, and changes them into the Efficacy of his Flesh.*

And in the fore-cited place of his Comment upon *John* (p) he says, The least particle of the Eucharist mixing it self with our whole Body, *fills it with its own Efficacy, &c.*

Theodoret (q) tells those that partake of the Divine Mysteries, That they must not consider the Nature of the Things seen, but upon the change of Names, *believe the change made by Grace.* And he adds, That Christ honoured the visible Symbols with the Name of his Body and Blood, *not changing the Nature* (or Substance) *of them, but adding Grace to Nature.*

Theophylact (r) also says the same; *Our Lord preserves the Substance* (εἶδος, the same with φύσις in *Theodoret*) *of Bread and Wine, but changes them into the Virtue of his Flesh and Blood.*

Greg. Nyssen (s), speaking of the Privileges which *Consecration* advances things to, instances first in the Water of Baptism, and the great and marvellous Efficacy thereof; and proceeds to that of an Altar, which is at first but a common Stone, but after Dedication becomes an Holy Altar, which the Priests only touch with Veneration: And then adds the Instance of the Eucharist, *which at first is common Bread, but after the Mystery has consecrated it, it is called and becomes the Body of Christ. So the mystical Oil, and so the Wine before the Benediction, are things of little worth; but after the Sanctification of the Spirit, each of them operates excellently.*

So *Ammonius* (t) says, *The sensible Water is transelemented into a Divine Virtue* (for the Fathers make Changes in Baptism as well as the Eucharist) *and sanctifies those in whom it is.* Nay, he affirms, That *the Water differs only from the Spirit in our manner of Conception, for it is the same in Energy.*

Cyril

(o) *Apud Victor. Antioch. Com. MS. in Marc.* 14. Συγκαθιστάμενος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἀσθενείαις ἐνίησι τοῖς προκειμένοις δύναμιν ζωῆς, καὶ μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκός.

(p) *In Joan.* 6. 57.

Τῆς ἰδίας ἐνεργείας ἀναπληροῖ.

(q) *Dialog.* 1.

Πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγενημένῃ μεταβολῇ.

—Οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικώς.

(r) *In cap* 14. *Marc.* Τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου φυλάττει, εἰς δύναμιν δὲ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος μεταστοιχειοῖ.

(s) *Orat. in Bapt. Christi.*

Ἄρτος ὀστὶ τέως κοινὸς, ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεταί τε καὶ γίνεται· οὕτως τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος ὀλίγου τινὸς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸ τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὴν ἁγιασμὸν τὴν τῶν πνεύματος, ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖ διαφόρως.

(t) *Catena in Joan.* 3. 5. Τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θείαν ἀναστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν καὶ ἁγιάζει τοὺς ἐν οἷς γένηται.

—*Ibid.* Τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπινοίᾳ μόνον διαφορὰν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐπεὶ ταὐτὸν ὀστὶ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*u*) calling the *Flesh* and *Bread* in the Feast of Idols *defiled*, by the Invocation of impure Devils, he illustrates it thus. *As the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist, before the Invocation of the adored Trinity*, is bare Bread and Wine; *but after Invocation, the Bread is made the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ; so also in the same manner those Meats of the Pomp of Satan, in their own Nature being simple things, yet by the Invocation of Devils they become impure.*

(*u*) *Catech. Mystag.* 1. Μιασθέντα.

Ἄρτος ὢν καὶ οἶνος λιτός.

Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τὰ τοιαῦτα βρώματα τῆς πομπῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ, τῇ ἰδίᾳ φύσει λιτὰ ὄντα, τῇ ἐπικλήσει τῶν δαιμόνων βέβηλα γίνεται.

That's the Change here, That those Meats are in Quality (not in Substance) made impure; and so (if the Comparison hold) the Change in the other is, That they are *Hallowed Bread and Wine*, in Use and Efficacy different from what they were before.

The Author under *Cyprian*'s Name (*x*), speaking of Chrysm, says, *Truth is in the Sign, and the Spirit in the Sacrament.*

(*x*) *De Unct. Chrysmat.* Inest Veritas signo, & Spiritus Sacramento.

Thus S. *Ambrose* (*y*) understands the *Body of Christ* for that *Divine Substance and Presence of the Spirit* (which is the δυνάμις & ἐνέργεια of Christ's Body). *Christ is in that Sacrament, because it is the Body of Christ. It is not therefore Corporeal but Spiritual Food: For the Body of God is a Spiritual Body. The Body of Christ is the Body of the Divine Spirit* (not his natural Body) *because it is the Spirit of Christ.*

(*y*) *De iis qui init. c.* 9. *in fine*

In illo Sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritalis est. Corpus enim Dei corpus est Spiritale. Corpus Christi, corpus est divini Spiritus, quia Spiritus Christi (sc. est.)

Here *Corpus Dei* is *Corpus Spiritale*, that is, *Substantia Spiritalis, & Spiritus.*

The Author under his Name (*z*). *How can that which is Bread be the Body of Christ? By Consecration.——To answer thee therefore, It was not the Body of Christ before Consecration; but after Consecration, I tell thee, it is the Body of Christ.* He said it, and it was done; he commanded, and it was created. *Thou thy self wast an old Creature; but after thou wast consecrated, thou begangst to be a new Creature*, &c.

(*z*) *De Sacram. lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. Quomodo potest qui panis est, corpus esse Christi? Consecratione.—— Ergo ut tibi respondeam, Non erat corpus Christi ante consecrationem; sed post consecrationem, dico tibi, quod corpus est Christi. Ipse dixit, & factum est; ipse mandavit, & creatum est. Tu ipse eras vetus creatura; posteaquam consecratus es nova creatura esse cœpisti, &c.

So

So that, according to this Author, as in Regeneration by Baptiſm Man changes his Nature, ſo do's the Conſecrated Bread in the Euchariſt change its Nature. Therefore it is no ſubſtantial Change, becauſe the other confeſſedly is not ſo.

Druthmarus (a), ſpeaking of a Perſon taking a long Journey, and leaving a Pledge behind him to remember him by, he adds, *Thus alſo God has commanded us to do, ſpiritually changing the Bread into his Body, and the Wine into his Blood, that by theſe two things we may remember what he hath done for us with his Body and Blood, &c.*

(a) *Comm. in Matth.* 26. —Ita Deus præcipit agi à nobis, transferens ſpiritualiter panem in corpus, vinum in ſanguinem, ut per hæc duo memoremus quæ fecit pro nobis de corpore ſuo, &c.

5 *Aſſertion. The Fathers expreſs in the ſame manner, and as fully, our ſubſtantial Change into Chriſt's Body, as of the Bread into Chriſt's Body.* Yet none will from ſuch Expreſſions aſſert the former; and there is the ſame reaſon not to do the latter.

Gr. Nyſſen (b). As a little Leaven, according to the Apoſtle, likens the whole Maſs to it ſelf; *ſo the Body* (of Chriſt) *put to death by God, coming into our Body, do's change and convert the whole into it ſelf.*

(b) *Orat. Catech. cap.* 37. Οὕτως τὸ ἀναλωθὲν ὑπὸ τῆ Θεῦ σῶμα ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ γενόμενον ὅλον πρὸς ἑαυτὸ μεταποιεῖ καὶ μεταλλάττει.

——Τὸ ἀθάνατον σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἀναλαβόντι αὐτὸ γενόμενον, πρὸς ἑαυτῆ φύσιν τὸ πᾶν μεταποίησιν.

And again, a little after. *His immortal Body being in him that receives it, changes the whole into its own Nature.*

(c) *In Joan. lib.* 4. *cap.* 3. ——Ἐν ἑαυτῷ ζῆσαι, πάντως ὅλῳ εἰς ἐμὲ μεταστοιχειώμενον.

Cyril of *Alexandria* (c) ſays, *He that receives me by a participation of my Fleſh, ſhall have Life in himſelf, being wholly tranſelemented into me.*

(d) *De Nat. Dom. Serm.* 10. Chriſti caro de utero virginis ſumpta, nos ſumus.

P. *Leo Magn.* (d). *We are the Fleſh of Chriſt, taken from the Womb of the Virgin.*

(e) *Id. de Paſſion. Serm.* 14. Non aliud agit Participatio corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti, quàm ut in id quod ſumimus tranſeamus.——Ipſum per omnia ſpiritu & carne geſtemus.

And elſewhere (e). *The Participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt intends nothing elſe but that we ſhould paſs into that which we receive.* ——That *we may carry him in all things both in Spirit and Fleſh.* (Not as *Bellarmine* and others pervert the Senſe, reading *guſtemus.*)

Again,

Again, in another place (*f*). *In that myſtical Diſtribution of Spiritual Food, this is beſtowed on us, this is taken, that receiving the Virtue of the Celeſtial Meat, we ſhould paſs into his Fleſh, who was made our Fleſh.*

(*f*) *Epiſt.* 23. In illa myſticâ diſtributione ſpiritualis alimoniæ, hoc impertitur, hoc ſumitur, ut accipientes virtutem cœleſtis cibi in carnem ipſius, quia caro noſtra factus eſt, tranſeamus.

See more Teſtimonies to this ſenſe in the Chapter following, Poſition 3.

CHAP. IX.

The Ninth Difference.

The Fathers *differ from the Church of* Rome, *in their Belief of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt. The Church of* Rome *aſſerts the ſubſtantial Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Body there; but the* Fathers *deny it.*

THe former is the Aſſertion of the *Roman Church* in the *Trent Council*, in which an *Anathema* is pronounced (*g*) againſt ſuch as deny, *That in the Holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt is contained truly, really, and Subſtantially the Body and Blood of Chriſt,——but ſhall ſay, That he is in it only as in a Sign, or Figure, or Virtue.* And the *Catechiſm ad Parochos* (*h*) ſays, That *the True Body of our Lord Chriſt, the ſame that was born of the Virgin, and ſits in the Heavens at the Right-hand of the Father, is contained in this Sacrament.*

(*g*) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 6. *Can.* 1.

(*h*) *Part.* 2. *de Euchariſt. n.* 25.

I will now ſhew, that the Fathers advance ſuch Poſitions as plainly contradict this Doctrine.

1 Poſition. *The Fathers ever ſince Chriſt's departure and Aſcenſion into Heaven, look upon his Body as abſent from Earth, tho' in another ſenſe he is ſtill preſent.*

All thoſe Teſtimonies before produced under the Fifth Difference, concerning Bodies being commenſurate to Space, and not being in more places than one, and ſaying this of *Chriſt's Body* as well as of other Bodies, are a Proof of this Poſition; but beſides thoſe, I will here add ſome further direct Proofs of it.

S. *Ambroſe* thus (*i*). *Aſcend* (ſpeaking to Chriſt) *that we may follow thee with our Minds, whom we cannot ſee with our Eyes.* S. Paul *has taught us how we ſhould follow thee, and where we may find thee.* Seek thoſe things that are above, where Chriſt ſits, *&c.*——*Therefore we ought not to ſeek thee upon Earth, nor in the Earth, nor according to the Fleſh, if we would find thee.*

(*i*) *Com. in Luc.* 24. Aſcende nobis, ut te ſequamur mentibus, quem oculis videre non poſſumus, *&c.*——Ergo non ſupra terram, nec in terra, nec ſecundùm carnem quærere te debemus, ſi volumus invenire. Nunc enim ſecundùm carnem non novimus Chriſtum.

——Mary

—Mary *could not touch him, becauſe ſhe ſought him on Earth:* Stephen *touched him, becauſe he ſought him in Heaven.* Stephen *among the Jews ſaw him abſent.*

S. *Auſtin* is ſo copious in this Argument, and his Teſtimonies ſo many, that a good Choice of them is only neceſſary. Thus he ſays (*k*). *Therefore our Lord abſented himſelf from every Church, and aſcended into Heaven, that our Faith may be edified; for if thou knoweſt nothing but what thou ſeeſt, where is Faith?*

Again (*l*). *Chriſt is always with us by his Divinity; but unleſs he were corporally abſent from us, we ſhould always carnally ſee his Body, and ſhould never ſpiritually believe.*

This is a clear Teſtimony, that Chriſt is abſent as to his Natural Body; and that if it were not ſo, he would be viſible to us ſtill.

Again (*m*), expounding thoſe words, *The Poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always; He ſpake this,* ſays he, *concerning the Preſence of his Body: For according to his Majeſty, according to his Providence, according to his unſpeakable and inviſible Grace, that is fulfilled which he ſaid,* Behold I am always with you, *&c. But according to the Fleſh which he aſſumed, according to what was born of the Virgin, &c.* (directly contrary to the *Trent* Catechiſm) *ye ſhall not have me always with you.*

And in another place (*n*). *According to the beautiful Preſence of his Divinity, he is always with the Father; according to his corporal Preſence he is now above the Heavens, at the right hand of the Father* (he forgot to add, and in the Holy Sacrament) *but according to the Preſence of Faith,* ſo he is *in all Chriſtians.*

What can be more plain than another Saying of his (*o*)? *We believe on him who ſits now at the right hand of the Father; but yet whilſt we are in the Body, we are abſent, as in a ſtrange*

—— *Maria* quia quærebat in terra, tangere non potuit; *Stephanus* tetigit, quia quæſivit in cœlo. *Stephanus* inter Judæos vidit abſentem.

(*k*) *Serm.* 140. *de Tempore.* Ideo Dominus noſter abſentavit ſe corpore ab omni Eccleſia, & aſcendit in cœlum, ut fides ædificetur: ſi enim non nôſti niſi quod vides, ubi eſt fides?

(*l*) *Serm.* 60. *de Verb. Dom.* Semper quidem Divinitate nobiſcum eſt, ſed niſi corporaliter abiret à nobis, ſemper ejus corpus carnaliter videremus, & nunquam ſpiritualiter crederemus.

(*m*) *Tract.* 50. *in Joannem.* Loquebatur de præſentia corporis ſui: nam ſecundùm Majeſtatem ſuam, ſecundùm Providentiam, ſecundùm ineffabilem & inviſibilem Gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum eſt, *Ecce ego vobiſcum omnibus diebus, &c.* Secundùm carnem vero quam aſſumpſit, ſecundùm id quod de Virgine natus eſt, &c. non ſemper habebitis me vobiſcum.

(*n*) *Serm.* 120. *de diverſis.* Secundùm præſentiam pulchritudinis & divinitatis ſuæ ſemper cum patre eſt; ſecundùm præſentiam corporalem jam ſupra cœlos ad dextram patris eſt; ſecundùm præſentiam vero fidei in omnibus Chriſtianis eſt.

(*o*) *Serm.* 74. *de diverſis.* Credimus in eum jam ſedentem ad dextram patris; ſed tamen quamdiu ſumus in corpore peregrinamur ab eo; nec

eum dubitantibus, vel negantibus & dicentibus, *Ubi eſt Deus tuus*, valemus oſtendere.

Country from him; nor can we ſhew him to thoſe that doubt, to thoſe that deny him, and ſay, Where is thy God?

If S. *Auſtin* had believed, as the *Roman* Church do's, the Corporal Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, he could have pointed to him upon the Altar, if any had asked, *Where is thy God?*

(p) *In Joan.* 9. 5. Κἂν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦμεν δι' ἀπέρχεται πάλιν ἐλθὼν ἦλθον τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅπως ἦσαν τοῖς ὅλοις ἡ θεία τε καὶ ἄῤῥητος αὐτοῦ φύσις, ἀδύνατος ἀποδημῆσαι τὴν οὐσίαν, ἢ ἀπολιμπανόμενόν τινος πανταχῇ ἢ τοῖς πᾶσι παρόντα καὶ πληροῦντα μὴ τὸ ἓν τὸ συμπᾶν.

Cyril of *Alexandria* (p) ſays, *Tho' Chriſt be abſent from the World as to his Fleſh, yet he is preſent to thoſe that are in him, and to the whole Univerſe, by his Divine and Ineffable Nature; neither is he abſent from any Creature, nor diſtant from any, but is every where preſent to all, and fills the whole Univerſe.*

(q) *In Joan.* 17. 12.

And elſewhere (q), ſpeaking of the Diſciples, who thought it a great loſs to them, that being taken up to Heaven, he would now be abſent according to his Fleſh, he ſays, They ought not only to have reſpected and looked *to his Fleſhly Preſence*, but to have underſtood, that *tho' he was ſeparated from their Society according to the Fleſh, nor could be ſeen by their bodily Eyes, yet that he was preſent and aſſiſtant always by the Power of his Divinity.*

Εἰς τὸ ἓν ὑπαρχον παρουσίαν.

—Εἰ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν σωματικὸς ἀπονοσφίζοιτο χάριτι σάρκα—— ἀλλὰ καὶ παρόντα καὶ σωίζοντα διὰ παντὸς τῇ τοῦ θεότητος ἐξουσίᾳ.

(r) *Ad Traſimund. l.* 2. *c.* 17. Unus idemque ſecundùm humanam ſubſtantiam, abſens cœlo cùm eſſet in terra, & derelinquens terram cum aſcendiſſet in cœlum. Secundùm Divinam vero immenſamque ſubſtantiam nec cœlum dimittens, cùm de cœlo deſcendit, nec terram deſerens cùm ad cœlum aſcendit.

Fulgentius (r). *One and the ſame* (Chriſt) *according to his Humane Subſtance, was abſent from Heaven when he was upon Earth, and left Earth when he aſcended up to Heaven; but according to his Divine and Immenſe Subſtance, neither left Heaven when he deſcended from Heaven, nor forſook Earth when he aſcended into Heaven.*

(s) *Id. ibid. c.* 18. Quomodo corporaliter aſcendit in cœlum, & in ſuis fidelibus prædicatur eſſe in terra, ſi non eſt in illo divinitatis immenſitas quæ cœlum implere poſſit & terram?

Again (s). *How did he corporally aſcend into Heaven, and yet is ſaid to be in the Faithful on Earth, unleſs the Immenſity of the Divinity be in him, which can fill Heaven and Earth?* Yes, a *Romaniſt* would have told him of another way, That even his Body could be preſent in Heaven and Earth, *after the manner of a Spirit.*

(t) *Contr. Eutych. l.* 1. Hoc erat ire ad patrem & recedere

Vigilius Tapſ. (t). *This was to go to the Father and recede from us, to take from the World the Nature*

Nature that he had taken from us.—— *For ſee the Miracle, ſee the Myſtery of both* (Natures) *diſtinct* (not a Word of the Myſtery of a Body being in more places than one); *The Son of God according to his Humanity departed from us; according to his Divinity he ſays to us,* Behold I am with you always, *&c.*—— *Thoſe whom he left and departed from by his Humanity, he did not leave nor forſake by his Divinity.*

Again (*u*). *When Chriſt was on Earth, he was not in Heaven; and now becauſe he is in Heaven, he ſurely is not on Earth,* &c.—— *Becauſe the* Word *is every where, but his Fleſh is not every where, it appears plainly, that one and the ſame Chriſt is of both Natures, and that he is every where according to the Nature of his Divinity, and contained in a Place according to the Nature of his Humanity* (which would be a bad Argument, if his Body were in Heaven and in the Euchariſt at the ſame time). And then he concludes, *This is the Catholick Faith and Confeſſion, which the Apoſtles delivered, the Martyrs confirmed, and the Faithful now ſtill keep and preſerve.*

Leo Magn. (*x*). *Chriſt being raiſed up to Heaven in ſight of his Diſciples, he put an end to his bodily Preſence.* (So he explains it, that he was to remain at the Right-hand of his Father, till he ſhould come again to judge the Quick and Dead.)

Bede (*y*). *Chriſt aſcending after his Reſurrection into Heaven as a Conqueror, left the Church as to his bodily Preſence, which yet he never left deſtitute of the ſecurity of his Divine Preſence, remaining in the Church always to the end of the World.*

This may abundantly ſuffice to prove the *Firſt Poſition.*

à nobis, auferre de mundo naturam quam ſuſceperat à nobis.——Nam vide miraculum, vide utriuſque proprietatis myſterium, Dei filius ſecundùm humanitatem ſuam receſſit à nobis, ſecundùm divinitatem ſuam ait nobis, *Ecce vobiſcum ſum omnibus diebus, &c.*— Quos reliquit & à quibus deceſſit humanitate ſua, non reliquit nec deſeruit divinitate ſua.

(*u*) *Id. ibid. l.* 4. Quando in terra fuit, non erat utique in cœlo, & nunc quia in cœlo eſt non eſt utique in terra, &c.— Quia verbum ubique eſt, caro autem ejus ubique non eſt, apparet unum eundemque Chriſtum utriuſque eſſe naturæ, & eſſe quidem ubique ſecundùm naturam divinitatis ſuæ, & loco contineri ſecundùm naturam humanitatis ſuæ.

——Hæc eſt Fides & Confeſſio Catholica, quam Apoſtoli tradiderunt, Martyres roboraverunt, & Fideles nunc uſque cuſtodiunt.

(*x*) *Serm.* 2. *de Aſcenſ. Dom.* Chriſtus coram Diſcipulis elevatus in cœlum, corporalis præſentiæ modum fecit.

(*y*) *Com. in Marc.* 13. Chriſtus ad Patrem poſt reſurrectionem victor aſcendens, Eccleſiam corporaliter reliquit, quam tamen nunquam divinæ præſidio præſentiæ deſtituit, manens in illa omnibus diebus uſque ad conſummationem ſeculi.

2 Poſition. *The Fathers diſtinguiſh the Preſence of Chriſt's Body from the Sacrament of it, which they make to be*

be a Memorial and Pledge of Christ, as gone away and absent.

(z) *In* 1 *Cor.* 11. 29.

Ζωὴν βρύουσα βάπτιζα.

Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ, ἡ τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀπόῤῥητα χαρίζασα ἡμῖν ἀγαθὰ τοῦ μὴ δικαίως αὐτῷ μαλλὸν κρῖναι, ὅτι καὶ τὰ μυστήρια μείζονος ἐπόδια κολάσεως γίνῃ τοῖς ἀναξίως μετέχουσι.

S. *Chryſoſtome* (z), expounding thoſe words, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment*; and asking how that Table, which is the Cauſe of ſo many good things, *and flows with Life*, ſhould be made Condemnation to any, reſolves it thus; That this happens not from its own Nature, but from the Purpoſe of him that approaches this Table. *For*, ſays he, *as Chriſt's Preſence, which brought thoſe great and unſpeakable Bleſſings to us, did condemn thoſe the more that did not receive it; ſo alſo the Myſteries make way for greater Puniſhments to thoſe that unworthily partake of them.* A remarkable Teſtimony, becauſe we ſee he diſtinguiſhes the Preſence of Chriſt, the Sacrament of it; compares the one with the other, and becauſe of the Relation that the Myſteries have to Chriſt, and that both are intended to convey great Bleſſings, therefore they both, when unworthily treated, occaſion greater Puniſhments.

(a) *Contr. Fauſt. l.* 20. *c.* 21. Hujus ſacrificii caro & ſanguis ante adventum Chriſti per victimas ſimilitudinum promittebatur, in paſſione Chriſti per ipſam veritatem reddebatur, poſt aſcenſum Chriſti per Sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.

S. *Auſtin* (a). *The Fleſh and Blood of this Sacrifice, before Chriſt's coming, was promiſed by Victims of Reſemblance, in the Paſſion of Chriſt it was exhibited in the Truth it ſelf; after Chriſt's Aſcenſion it is celebrated by the Sacrament of Remembrance.* Where you ſee, the *Sacrament of Remembrance* is oppoſed to the *Exhibition of the Truth.*

(b) *In* 1 *Cor.* 11. Hoc eſt, benedicens etiam paſſurus, ultimam nobis commemorationem ſive memoriam dereliquit. Quemadmodum ſi quis peregrè proficiſcens, aliquod pignus ei quem diligit derelinquat, ut quotieſcunque illud viderit, poſſit ejus beneficia & amicitias memorari; quod ille ſi perfectè dilexit, ſine ingenti deſiderio non poſſit videre, vel fletu.

Author Comm. in Epiſtolas Pauli (inter Hieronymi Opera) (b), upon thoſe words, *He took Bread, and after he had given thanks, he brake it*: That is, ſays he, *bleſſing us even when he was about to ſuffer, he left his laſt Memorial with us. Juſt as if one travelling into another Country, ſhould leave a Pledge with him whom he loved, that whenſoever he look'd upon it, he might call to mind his Favours and Friendſhip; which ſuch a Perſon, if he perfectly lov'd him, could not behold without a great paſſion or weeping.*

It

It will be very hard to reconcile this *Pledge of Abſence* with ſuch a *conſtant Preſence* of his Body as the Church of *Rome* teaches, even there where we are required to look upon that Pledge, and remember our abſent Friend. *Sedulius* has the ſame Expoſition of the Place, almoſt in the ſame words.

Primaſius alſo confirms it (*c*), upon thoſe words, *The ſame night that our Lord was betrayed, he took Bread. He left*, ſays he, *to us his laſt Memorial.—— God our Saviour gave us an Example, that as often as we do this, we may call to mind that Chriſt has died for us all. Therefore we call it* Chriſt's Body, *that when we remember this, we may not be unthankful for his Grace. As if one that was a dying ſhould leave ſome Pledge to one whom he loved, which he, after his death, when ever he look'd upon, could not contain his Tears, if he perfectly loved him.*

(*c*) *In* 1 *Cor.* 11.

Ultimam nobis commemorationem reliquit.— Salvator Deus exemplum dedit, ut quotieſcunque hoc facimus, in mente habeamus, quod Chriſtus pro nobis omnibus mortuus eſt. Ideo nobis dicitur *Corpus Chriſti*, ut cùm hoc recordati fuerimus, non ſimus ingrati gratiæ ejus: quemadmodum ſi quis moriens relinquat ei quem diligit aliquod pignus, quod ille poſt mortem ejus, quandocunque viderit, nunquid poteſt lacrymas continere, ſi eum perfectè dilexerit?

Bede (*d*) has alſo given us the ſame Account. *As*, ſays he, Moſes *witneſſes that the Tree of Life was placed in the midſt of Paradiſe, ſo by the Wiſdom of God, to wit, of Chriſt, the Church has Life given it, in whoſe Sacraments of his Fleſh and Blood ſhe now receives* the Pledge of Life, *and hereafter ſhall be made happy in a* preſent Sight of him. Where you ſee he diſtinguiſhes *this Pledge* from his *preſent Aſpect* hereafter.

(*d*) *In Proverb. lib.* 1. *c.* 3. Sicut in medio Paradiſi, lignum vitæ poſitum teſtatur Moſes, ita per Sapientiam Dei, viz. Chriſti, vivificatur Eccleſia, cujus & nunc Sacramentis carnis & ſanguinis *pignus vitæ* accipit, & in futuro *præſenti* beatificabitur *aſpectu*.

Gaudentius (*e*) calls the Euchariſt *that hereditary Gift of his New Teſtament, which on the night that he was delivered to be crucified, he left with us as a Pledge of his Preſence. This is the Proviſion of our Journey, by which we are fed and nouriſhed in this way of Life, till removing from this World, we go to him.*

(*e*) *In Exod. tract.* 2. Vere illud eſt hæreditarium munus Teſtamenti ejus novi, quodquod nobis ea nocte qua tradebatur crucifigendus, tanquam pignus ſuæ præſentiæ dereliquit. Hoc illud eſt viaticum noſtri itineris, quo in hac via vitæ alimur ac nutrimur, donec ad ipſum pergamus de hoc ſeculo recedentes.

Still we ſee it is a *Pledge of Abſence*.

3 Poſition. *Whatſoever Preſence of Chriſt the Fathers ſpeak of in the Euchariſt, they acknowledge the ſame in Bap-*

tiſm,

tism, and in as full Expressions. So that if we will follow the *Fathers*, we may as well assert a Substantial Presence of Christ's Body in *Baptism*, as in the *Eucharist*. But this on all hands is denied.

Gaudentius (f) in the Place last cited, speaking of our Lord Jesus, says, *We believe him to be in his Sacraments.* He had spoke of both Sacraments before, and his words may well be understood of both. I am sure *other Fathers* give their full consent to it.

S. *Basil (g)* speaking of the Excellency of Christ's Baptism, and the supereminent Glory of it, says, That Christ the Son of God has determined it, *That one greater than the Temple, and greater than Solomon is here.*

So *Gr. Nazianzen (h)*. *Behold, one greater than the Temple is here, to them that perfectly consider.*

S. *Ambrose (i)*, speaking of Baptism, says, *O Christ, I find thee in thy Sacraments.*

And again *(k)*. *Believe that there is the Presence of the Divinity.*

So afterwards *(l)*. *Believe that the Lord Jesus is present, being invoked by the Prayers of the Priests.*

S. *Austin (m)*, upon those words, *The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always*; discourses thus concerning *having Christ* now. *Now thou hast Christ by Faith, now thou hast him by the Sign of Christ, now by the Sacrament of Baptism, now by the Meat and Drink of the Altar.*

Here you see he makes no difference of having Christ at present these several ways he mentions.

S. *Chrysostome (n)*. *As when thou art baptized, it is not he (viz.* the Priest) *that baptizes thee, but it is God that holds thy Head by his invisible Power, and neither Angel, nor Archangel, nor any other, dare approach and touch thee, &c.*

The same Father * thus speaks of one to be baptized, *Thou shalt presently embrace our Lord himself,*

(f) *Tract. 2 in Exod. in fine.* —— Quem Sacramentis suis inesse credimus.

(g) *De Baptism. lib. 1. cap. 2.* Μεῖζον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὧδε, καὶ μεῖζον τοῦ Σολομῶντος ὧδε.

(h) *Orat. 40.* Ἰδοὺ πλεῖον τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὧδε, πρὸς τοῖς τελείως λογιζομένοις.

(i) *Apol. David. c. 12.* Christe, in tuis te invenio Sacramentis.

(k) *De his qui initiant. c. 2.* Crede illic esse Divinitatis præsentiam.

(l) *Ibid. cap. 5.* Crede adesse Dominum Jesum invocatum precibus Sacerdotum.

(m) *In Joan. tract. 50.* Habes Christum in præsenti per fidem, in præsenti per signum Christi, in præsenti per baptismatis Sacramentum, in præsenti per altaris cibum & potum.

(n) *Hom. 51. in Matth. Lat. Græc. Savil. Hom. 50. pag. 322.* Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὅταν βαπτίζῃ, οὐκ αὐτός σε βαπτίζει, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ κατέχων σου τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀοράτῳ δυνάμει, καὶ οὔτε ἄγγελος, οὔτε ἀρχάγγελος, οὔτε ἄλλος τις τολμᾷ προσελθεῖν καὶ ἅψασθαι, &c.

* *Id. Epist. ad Colos. Hom. 6.*

himſelf, be mingled with his Body, be incorporated into that Body which is ſeated above, whither the Devil cannot approach.

So *the Author of the Commentaries upon S. Mark* (o) ſpeaks to thoſe that are to be baptized, as if Chriſt were preſent. *You that are to receive Baptiſm, firſt lay faſt hold on the Feet of your Saviour, waſh them with your Tears, wipe them with your Hair,* &c.

Marcus the *Hermite* (p) ſpeaking of a baptized Perſon, ſays, *Upon his Baptiſm he has Chriſt lying hid in him.*

S. *Chryſoſtome* again (q). *If Chriſt be the Son of God, and thou haſt put him on* (viz. in Baptiſm) *having the Son in thy ſelf, and being made like to him, thou art brought into one Kindred and Nature.*

Again elſewhere (r), ſpeaking of Chriſt's partaking of our Fleſh and Blood, he ſays, *He communicated with us, not we with him: How then are we of his Fleſh and of his Bones?* He means this; *That as he was begotten by the Holy Ghoſt without the concurrence of Man, ſo are we regenerate in Baptiſm.*—— *As therefore the Son of God was of our Nature, ſo are we alſo of his Subſtance; and as he had us in himſelf, ſo alſo we have him in our ſelves.* And all this is by Baptiſm.

Cyril of *Alexandr.* (s) ſays of the Soul, That *it is conjoined perfectly to Chriſt by holy Baptiſm.* And tho' every one knows that Union ſuppoſes Preſence and Nearneſs, yet this is never made an Argument that Chriſt is preſent corporally in *Baptiſm.* No more can ſuch like Phraſes, uſed by him concerning the *Euchariſt*, be urged as a Proof of it.

S. *Hilary* (t) ſpeaks many things of our real Union with Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. *We truly receive the Word in the Lord's Food; how is he not then to be thought naturally to dwell in us?*——*We under the Myſtery*

Αὐτὸν ἐνδῦναι φιλοχριστίᾳ τὸν διώκοντα, ἀναπεφῦσαι τῷ σώματι, ἀναρτῆσαι τῷ σώματι τῷ ἄνω κειμένῳ, ἵνα μὴ προσελθεῖν ἰσχύσῃ τῷ διαβόλῳ.

(o) *Inter Opera Chryſoſt. Hom.* 14. Vos qui accepturi eſtis Baptiſmum, primum tenete pedes Salvatoris, lavate lachrymis, crine tergite, *&c.*

(p) *De Baptiſm.* Ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ κεκρυμμένον ἔχει.

(q) *In Gal.* 3. v. 27. Εἰ ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι, τὸν υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπομοιωθείς, εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἰδέαν ἦλθες.

(r) *In Epheſ.* 5. v. 30. Ὅτι οὐσίας ἡμῶν σωτηρίας ἐκεῖνος γεγόνεν καὶ ἐν σπέρματι ἄνθρωπος, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡνώμεθα ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ.

——Ὡς ἐν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως. ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὡς ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος ἔσχε ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἔχωμεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

(s) *Tom.* 6. *in Collectan.* Συναρθῆναι τελείως τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος.

(t) *Lib.* 8. *de Trinit.* Nos verè Verbum cibo Dominico ſumimus, quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis exiſtimandus eſt? &c. ——Nos ſub Myſterio verè carnem corporis

ſui ſumimus, & per hoc unum erimus, quia Pater in illo eſt & ille in nobis.—— Ut cùm ille in Patre per naturam Divinitatis eſſet, nos contra in eo per corporalem Nativitatem, & ille rurſum in nobis per Sacramentorum ineſſe myſterium crederetur.

do truly take the Fleſh of his Body, and thereby ſhall be one, becauſe the Father is in him, and he in us. —— *So that ſince he was in the Father by the Nature of the Divinity, we on the contrary in him by Corporal Nativity, and he might be believed again to be in us by the Myſtery of the Sacraments.*

But then it is obſervable, that he do's not ſay theſe great things only of the *Euchariſt*, that by partaking of it we have a natural Union with Chriſt; but he ſays we have the ſame by *Faith*, by *Regeneration*, and by *Baptiſm* (*u*). *How doſt thou not underſtand a natural Unity in thoſe, who are one by the nature of one Faith?* —— Again, *The Unity of Conſent has no place in thoſe, who are one in the Regeneration of the ſame Nature.* —— Again, *What ſhould Agreement of Wills do here, when they are one by this, that they are cloathed with one Chriſt, by the Nature of one Baptiſm?*

(*u*) *Ibid.* Quomodo non naturalem in his intelligis unitatem, qui per naturam unius fidei unum ſunt? ——Ceſſat in his aſſenſûs unitas, qui unum ſunt in ejuſdem regeneratione naturæ. —— Quid hic animorum concordia faciet cum per id unum ſint, quod uno Chriſto per naturam unius Baptiſmi induantur?

I'le add but one Teſtimony more, out of *Fulgentius* (*x*); but it is very home. *Neither need any one at all doubt, that then every Believer is made Partaker of our Lord's Body and Blood, when he is made a Member of Chriſt in Baptiſm.*

(*x*) *De Bapt. Æthiop. cap. ult.* Nec cuiquam aliquatenus ambigendum eſt, tunc unumquemque fidelium corporis ſanguiniſque Dominici particip em fieri quando in Baptiſmate membrum Chriſti efficitur.

And yet even this do's not infer a Subſtantial Preſence of Chriſt in Baptiſm.

To make this Poſition ſtill more full and cogent, let me add, *That the Fathers ſo ſpeak of the Waters of Baptiſm, as if they were turned into Blood, and we dyed in that Blood, and baptized in Blood; and yet all theſe neither prove the Preſence of Chriſt's natural Body, nor Tranſubſtantiation there.*

To name a few Teſtimonies.

S. *Jerom* (*y*) upon thoſe words, *Waſh ye, make ye clean*, ſays, *Be ye baptized in my Blood by the Laver of Regeneration.*

(*y*) *In Eſa.* 1. Baptizemini in ſanguine meo per lavacrum regenerationis.

Again (*z*) he ſays of the Eunuch, *He was baptized in the Blood of the Lamb whom he read of* in the Prophet.

(*z*) Baptizatus eſt in ſanguine agni quem legebat. *In Eſa.* 43.

So

So S. *Auſtin* (*a*). *Whence comes Baptiſm to be red, but becauſe it is conſecrated with Chriſt's Blood?*

Proſper (*b*). *They are dyed in the Blood of Chriſt in Baptiſm.*

S. *Chryſoſtome* (*c*) ſpeaking to thoſe that were to receive Baptiſm. *You ſhall be cloathed with the Purple Garment dyed in the Lord's Blood.*

Julius Firmicus (*d*). *Seek for the Noble Fountains, enquire for the pure Waters, that there, after thy many Stains, the Blood of Chriſt with the Holy Spirit may make thee White.*

Cæſarius (*e*), or the *Author* of the *Paſchal Homily*. *The Soul enters the Waters of Life, that are red as it were, being conſecrated by the Blood of Chriſt.*

Iſidore of Sevil (*f*). *What is the Red Sea, but Baptiſm conſecrated by the Blood of Chriſt?*

And again (*g*). *The true Iſrael enters the Red Sea, to wit, Baptiſm, ſigned with the Blood of Chriſt.*

And *Primaſius* (*b*). *The Red Sea ſignifies Baptiſm, graced with the Blood of Chriſt.*

(*a*) *In Joan. tract.* 11. Unde rubet Baptiſmus, niſi ſanguine Chriſti conſecratus?

(*b*) *De Promiſſ. part.* 2. Baptiſmo ſanguine Chriſti tinguntur.

(*c*) *Catech. ad illuminand.* Τῶ πορφύρᾳ ἱερεῖ ἀλλοιωθῆς τῷ αἵματι βαφέντων δεσποτικῷ.

(*d*) *De Error. Prof. Relig.* c. 28. Quære fontes ingenuos, quære puros liquores, ut illic te poſt multas maculas cum Spiritu S. Chriſti ſanguis incandidet.

(*e*) *Hom.* 5. *Paſchal.* Ingreditur anima vitales undas, velut rubras ſanguine Chriſti conſecratas.

(*f*) *In Exod.* c. 19. Quid Mare rubrum, niſi Baptiſmum Chriſti ſanguine conſecratum?

(*g*) *De vocat. Gent.* c. 23. Verus Iſrael ingreditur Mare rubrum, baptiſmum ſcilicet Chriſti cruore ſignatum.

(*b*) *In* 1 *Cor.* 10. Mare rubrum ſignificat Baptiſmum Chriſti ſanguine decoratum.

4 Poſition. *The Fathers ſo conſider the Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, as can no way agree to the Preſence of his natural and glorified Body there.*

The Fathers (as I have before proved, ſee *Chap.* 7. *Obſerv.* 4. *Reaſon* 2.) look upon the *Bread and Wine* in the Euchariſt as the *Repreſentative Body* of Chriſt; and thus Chriſt's Body is indeed preſent by that which is its *Proxy* or *Pledge*: But this Preſence in a proper ſenſe is Abſence, and does ſuppoſe it.

I ſhall therefore here only inſiſt upon one Conſideration of Chriſt's Body there, which can only agree to his *Repreſentative Body*, but not to the *Natural* and *Glorified Body of Chriſt*. Viz.

The Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, which the Fathers ſpeak of, is of his Body as crucified, and ſlain, and dead. Now this cannot agree to his *Natural Body*, which, by our

Adverſaries Confeſſion is impaſſible and invulnerable now it is glorified, and cannot admit any ſeparation of Parts, which Crucifixion do's ſuppoſe, nor die any more. It is plain by the words of Inſtitution, that the Body of Chriſt there ſpoken of, is his *broken Body*, ſuch as Crucifixon cauſed, and his *Blood* is conſidered as *ſhed* and *poured out* of his Veins, and *ſeparated* from his Body, which our Adverſaries that ſpeak of his Preſence in the Sacrament do not believe.

But the Fathers did believe this, and ſay ſo; for which at the preſent, in ſtead of all, I need cite only S. *Chryſoſtome* (*i*), whoſe Phraſe for the Euchariſt is, *While this Death is perfected, this tremendous Sacrifice, theſe ineffable Myſteries.*

Again (*k*). *Chriſt lies before us ſlain.*

In another place (*l*). *While the Sacrifice is brought forth, and Chriſt the Lord's Sheep is ſlain.*

And elſewhere (*m*). *What doſt thou, O Man? Thou ſweareſt upon the Holy Table, and there thou killeſt thy Brother, where Chriſt lies ſlain.*

Again (*n*) he expreſſes it thus rhetorically: *When thou ſeeſt the Lord ſlain and lying, and the Prieſt ſtanding by the Sacrifice and praying, and all the People purple-dyed in that precious Blood, &c.*

Again in another place (*o*), ſpeaking of the Prieſt ſtanding before the Holy Table, &c. he adds, *When thou ſeeſt the Sheep* (viz. Chriſt) *ſlain and divided*, &c.

So alſo elſewhere (*p*). *O wonderful! The Myſtical Table being prepared, the Lamb of God ſlain for thee*, &c. *his Blood emptied into the Cup out of his immaculate Side, for thy Purification, doſt thou not fear?*

This ſlaying and dividing the Body of Chriſt, this emptying the Blood out of his Veins, he ſpeaks of, cannot be underſtood of any thing, but of his *Repreſentative Body.*

Neither can another Saying of his have any other ſenſe (*q*); where telling us how *Chriſt has given us leave to be filled with his holy Fleſh*, he adds, *He has propoſed himſelf before us ſlain.*

So

(*i*) *Hom.* 21. *in Act.* Τῦ δικαίου τὸν θάνατον τελειῦσθαι, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην θυσίαν, τὰ ἀῤῥητα μυστήρια.

(*k*) *Homil. de Prodit. Jude.* Ἐσφαγιασμένος κεῖται ὁ Χριστός.

(*l*) *In Epiſt. ad Epheſ. Hom.* 3. Ἐκφερομένης τῆς θυσίας, καὶ τῦ Χριστῦ τεθυμένου καὶ κειμένου τῆς δεσποτικῆς.

(*m*) *Ad Popul. Antioch. hom.* 15. —Ἔνθα ὁ Χριστὸς κεῖται τεθυμένος.

(*n*) *Lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio.* Ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸν κύριον τεθυμένον καὶ κείμενον, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ἱστάμενον τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ ἐπᾴδοντα, καὶ πάντας ἐκείνῳ τῷ τιμίῳ φοινιωμένους αἵματι, &c.

(*o*) *In Cœmeter. appel.* Ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸ πρόβατον ἐσφαγιασμένον καὶ διαιρούμενον, &c.

(*p*) *De Pœnit. in Encæn.* Τῆ αὐτῆ τῆς Θεῦ χάριτι σῦ σφαγιάζουσιν, &c. Τῦ αἵματος ἐν τῇ κύλικι εἰς σὲ κενῦσθαι ἐν τῇ ἀκηράτῳ πλευρᾷ τοσαύτῃ, καὶ φοβῆ;

(*q*) *Hom.* 51. *in Matth.* Τῶν ἀγίων σωμάτων αὐτὸν ἐμπλησθῆναι ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν—— ἑαυτὸν προέθηκε τεθυμένον.

XUM

So that if we eat his Fleſh, it muſt be his dead Body; for ſo he is ſet before us to be eaten: But that's impoſſible.

But all this is eaſily underſtood in our way, or rather as he himſelf has explained it, when he ſays (*r*), *The Myſtery is the Paſſion and Croſs of Chriſt.*

With which agrees that of S. *Auſtin* (*s*). *He gave his Supper, he gave his Paſſion.*

Or, as he ſays in another place (*t*), comparing the Gentiles to thoſe Dogs that lick'd *Lazarus*'s Sores; *Yet*, ſays he, *they lick the Paſſions of our Lord in the Sacraments of his Body and Blood with a devout Sweetneſs.*

The Reader will meet with further Teſtimonies to this purpoſe afterwards, under the Head of *Eating Chriſt's Body* and *drinking his Blood*, which, according to the *Fathers*, is to be done *myſtically* and *ſpiritually* (conſidered as ſlain), and therefore his Preſence muſt be ſuch too: For his Body is *preſent* juſt as it is *eaten*.

The Sum of all is this, That according to the *Fathers*, Chriſt is conſidered in the Sacrament as *dead and ſlain*, and therefore can be only preſent there *typically* and by *repreſentation*: For ſo *Card. Perron* himſelf confeſſes (*u*), *The Sacrament is not really the Body of Chriſt, put in the actual ſtate of one ſlain, dead, and without Life; nor do's it contain it ſo, but in that reſpect do's only repreſent it.*

(*r*) *Hom.* 83. *in Matth.* Μυϛήριον δὲ τὸ πάθος ϗ ὁ ϛαυρός.

(*s*) *In Pſal.* 21. Cœnam ſuam dedit, paſſionem ſuam dedit.

(*t*) *Super Evang lib.* 2. *qu.* 38. ——Tamen paſſiones Domini in Sacramentis corporis & ſanguinis ejus ſuavitate lambunt devotiſſimâ.

(*u*) *De loc. Auguſtin. cap.* 3. Sacramentum non eſt realiter corpus Chriſti in actuali occiſi, mortui & inanimati ſtatu conſtitutum, nec eâ ratione illud continet, ſed eatenus tantum repræſentat, *&c.*

5 Poſition. *That according to the Fathers, the Preſence of Chriſt's Body to us now, is a Preſence to our Faith and Minds, a Preſence of Union, of Efficacy and Grace.*

This is S. *Auſtin*'s conſtant Doctrine. I have cited a place out of him before, where reckoning up the ſeveral Preſences of Chriſt (*x*), the *Preſence of his Divinity*, ſo he is with his Father; his *Corporal Preſence*, ſo, he ſays, he is *now above the Heavens, at the Right Hand of the Father*; and he knows but one more, which is the *Preſence of Faith, by which he is in all Chriſtians.*

(*x*) *Serm.* 120. *de diverſis.* ——Secundùm præſentiam corporalem jam ſupra cœlos ad dexteram patris eſt. ——Secundùm verò præſentiam fidei in omnibus Chriſtianis eſt.

Thus

Thus also elsewhere (*y*). *Christ is in Heaven, but he is also in the Hearts of Believers.*

And again (*z*), exhorting the Jews *to hear and take hold on Christ*, he brings one in asking, *Whom shall I lay hold of? one that is absent? &c.* He answers, *Send forth thy Faith, and thou hast hold of him. Thy Fathers laid hold of him in his Flesh, do thou hold him in thy Heart, because Christ who is absent, is also present; for if he were not present, he could not be held by us.* But still all is to be done *by Faith*, for the Reason he gives; *He brought his Body into Heaven, but his Majesty* (*i. e.* his Divinity) *was not withdrawn from the World.*

And afterwards (*a*). *According to the Presence of his Majesty, we always have Christ; according to the Presence of his Flesh, it was rightly said to his Disciples*, Me ye have not always. *The Church had him a few days according to his Fleshly Presence; now it holds him by Faith, and sees him not.*

So again (*b*), speaking of those *whom he kept when he was with them*, he says, *These Words can be rightly understood of none but those who believing on him, were begun to be kept by him by his Corporal Presence, and whom he was about to leave by his Bodily Absence, that he might keep them, together with his Father, by his Spiritual Presence.*

Lastly, S. *Austin* says (*c*), *Our Lord comforting us, who now that he sits in Heaven cannot handle him, but only touch him by Faith, says to* Thomas, Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and believe.

S. *Cyril of Alexandria* agrees perfectly with this Doctrine (*d*), and knows no other Presence of Christ now, but what is Spiritual and Divine, since he ascended to the Father, and left the World. *For they that judge aright, and are of a confirmed Faith, must be persuaded, that tho' Christ*

(*y*) *Serm.* 12. *de diversis.* In cœlo quidem Christus est, sed etiam in corde credentium.*

(*z*) *In Evang. Joan. tract.* 50. —— Audeant & teneant. Respondet, Quem tenebo? absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, & tenuisti: parentes tui tenuerunt carnem, tu tene corde, quoniam Christus absens etiam præsens est, nisi præsens esset à nobis teneri non posset, *&c.* ——Corpus enim suum intulit cœlo, majestatem non abstulit mundo.

(*a*) *Ibid. propè finem.* Secundùm præsentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum: secundùm præsentiam carnis rectè dictum est discipulis, *Me autem non semper habebitis.* Habuit illum Ecclesia secundùm præsentiam carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt.

(*b*) *In Ev. Joan. tract.* 106. Non rectè intelliguntur —nisi hi quos in se credentes servare jam cœperat præsentia corporali, & quos relicturus fuerat absentia corporali, ut eos cum patre servaret præsentia spiritali.

(*c*) *Expos. in Epist. Joan. tract.* 1. Dominus consolans nos qui ipsum jam in cœlo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed fide contingere, ait illi, *Quia vidisti & credidisti, beati qui non viderunt & credunt.*

(*d*) *In Joan.* 13. 33. Διακεῖσθαι δὲ δεῖν ἀναγκαῖον εἰ φημὶ, τοὺς οἵγε φρονοῦσιν ὀρθῶς, καὶ ἱδρυμένην ἔχουσι τὴν πίστιν, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἄπεστιν ἡμῶν τῇ σαρκὶ, τὴν

Chriſt be abſent from us in the Fleſh, having undertaken a long Journey to God and the Father, that yet he compaſſes all things by his Divine Power, and is preſent to them that love him, &c.

And again (*e*). *It ſeemed to them intolerable, to be ſeparated from Chriſt, tho' he was always preſent with them by the Power and Efficacy of the Spirit.*

(*e*) *Ibid. in* v. 36. Οὐ φορητὸν ἦν δοκεῖν τὸ χωρίζεσθαι Χριστοῦ, καίτοι συνὼν & αὐτοῖς διὰ πίστεως τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν & δυνάμεως & ἐνεργείας.

Elſewhere (*f*) he lays it down as a Rule, *That Chriſt's Spirit dwelling in the Saints, ſupplies the Preſence and Power of Chriſt* in his abſence.

(*f*) *In Joan.* 14. 27. Τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν & ἐνέργειαν ἀναπληροῖ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐνοικοῦν.

And many more Places I might name out of him.

Their Senſe is well expreſt in that ſhort Saying of the *Author* under S. *Cyprian's* (*g*) Name, which I'le again repeat. *Truth is in the Sign, and the Spirit in the Sacrament.*

(*g*) *De Unct. Chryſmat.* Ineſt veritas ſigno, & Spiritus Sacramento.

S. *Ambroſe* (*h*) knows of no other Preſence of Chriſt now, but what makes the Father to be preſent with him too, and that is the Preſence of the Spirit and of Grace. His Words are very remarkable. *The Spirit then ſo comes, as the Father comes: For the Son ſaid,* I and my Father will come, and make our abode with him. *What? do's the Father come corporally?* (And the ſame may be ask'd too of the Son, by what follows.) *The Spirit ſo comes, as that in him when he comes is the full Preſence of the Father and the Son.*—— A little after, *We have therefore proved, that there is one Preſence, and that there is one Grace* (which explains what the Preſence is) *of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, which is ſo Celeſtial and Divine, that the Son gives thanks to the Father for it,* &c.

(*h*) *De Spir. Sanct. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *propè finem.*

Sic ergo venit Spiritus, quemadmodum venit Pater: dixit enim Filius, *Ego & Pater veniemus & manſionem apud eum faciemus.* Nunquid corporaliter Pater venit? Sic ergo Spiritus venit, in quo cum venit, & Patris & Filii plena præſentia eſt.—— *Paulò poſt,* Probavimus igitur unam præſentiam eſſe, unam gratiam eſſe, Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, quæ tam cœleſtis & divina eſt, ut pro ea gratias agat Patri Filius, &c.

Bede (*i*) obſerving how many times Chriſt appeared to his Diſciples after his Reſurrection, ſays, *He deſigned to ſhew by theſe frequent Appearances, that he would be ſpiritually or divinely preſent in all Places at the Deſire of the Faithful.*

(*i*) *Hom. aſt. de temp. feria* 6. *Paſch.*

Hac ergo frequentia corporalis ſuæ manifeſtationis oſtendere voluit Dominus, ut diximus, in omni loco, ſe bonorum deſide-

riis divinitùs esse præsentem. Apparuit namque ad monumentum lugentibus, aderit & nobis absentiæ ejus recordatione salubriter contristatis. Apparuit in fractione panis his, qui se peregrinum esse putantes ad hospitium vocaverunt, aderit & nobis cùm peregrinis & pauperibus quæcunque possumus bona libenter impendimus. Aderit & nobis in fractione panis, cùm *Sacramenta corporis ejus*, videlicet panis vivi, casta & simplici conscientia sumimus.

(k) *In Joan. lib. 6. cap.* 35. Et idem ipse Christus & homo & Deus. Ergo ibat per id quod homo erat, & manebat per id quod Deus erat. Ibat per id quod in uno loco erat, & manebat per id quod ubique Deus erat.

(l) *De bono Persev. l.* 2. *c.*13. Quod ergo in Sacramentis fidelium dicitur, ut *sursum corda habeamus ad Dominum*, munus est Domini—— ut ascendat & quæ sursum sunt sapiat, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens, non quæ super terram, &c.

(m) *Ad Hedybiam qu.* 2. Ascendamus cum Domino cœnaculum magnum stratum & mundatum, & accipiamus ab eo *sursum* calicem N. Testamenti, ibique cum eo Pascha celebrantes inebriemur ab eo vino sobrietatis.

(n) *Hom.* 24. *in* 1 *Cor.* 10.

Faithful. He appear'd to the Women that wept at the Sepulcher; he will be likewise present with us, when we grieve at the remembrance of his absence. He appear'd, whilst they broke Bread, to those who, taking him for a Stranger, gave him entertainment; he will be likewise with us whilst we liberally receive the Poor and Strangers: He will be likewise with us in the Fraction of Bread, when we receive the Sacraments of his Body, which is the Living Bread, with a pure and chaste Heart.

All this speaks only the Presence of his Divinity, and no other.

For, as *Alcuinus* (k) says, *The same Christ who is Man, is likewise God; he left them as to his Manhood, but remained with them as to his Godhead. He went away, with reference to that, by which he is but in one place,* (N. B.) *yet tarried with them by his Divinity, which is every where.*

All *Liturgies*, when the Eucharist is celebrated, call aloud, Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας, *Sursum corda*, Lift up your Hearts. The meaning of which we are told by S. *Austin* (l). *What therefore is said in the Sacraments of the Faithful, that we should* lift up our Hearts to the Lord, *it is a Gift of the Lord.* And he explains it, *That by the Divine Aid the Soul is helped to ascend, and set its Affections upon things above, where Christ is sitting at God's right Hand, and not upon things on the Earth.*

S. *Jerom*'s Words (m) are very emphatical. *Let us, with our Lord, ascend the great upper Room prepared and made clean, and receive from him* above *the Cup of the New Testament, and there celebrating the Passover with him, be inebriated by him with the Wine of Sobriety.*

All you see is *above*, and our Presence too with him there.

S. *Chrysostome* (n) speaking how we ought to approach to the tremendous Sacrifice with Concord

Concord and ardent Charity, says, *From thence we become Eagles, and so fly to Heaven it self: For,* where the Carcase is, thither will the Eagles come. *He calls his Body* the Carcase, *because of his Death; and he calls them* Eagles, *shewing, that he who comes to this Body ought to be sublime, and have nothing common with Earth, nor be drawn downward and creep, but continually fly upward, and look to the Sun of Righteousness, and to have the Eye of his Mind quick-sighted: For this is a Table for Eagles, not for Jackdaws.*

Πτῶμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον.— ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, δεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν προσίοντα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχειν, μηδὲ κάτω σύρεσθαι καὶ ἕρπειν, ἀλλ' ἄνω πέτεσθαι διηνεκῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐνορᾶν, καὶ ὀξυδερκὲς τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχειν· ἀετῶν γὰρ, οὐ κολοιῶν αὕτη ἡ τράπεζα.

Gr. Nazianzen (o) speaking of his Adversaries, says, *Will they drive me from the Altars? I know another Altar, whose Types the things now seen are, upon which no Ax has been lift up, no Iron Tool or other Instrument has been heard; but is wholly a Work of the Mind, and an Ascent by Contemplation. Before this will I present my self, on this will I offer acceptable things, Sacrifice, Oblation, and Holocausts, so much more excellent than the things now offered, as Truth excels a Shadow.*

(o) *Orat.* 28. *contr. Maxim.*

Οὗ τύποι τὰ νῦν ὁρωμένα.

Ὅλον τῶν νοῦ τὸ ἔργον, καὶ διὰ θεωρίας ἡ ἀνάβασις.——

Κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ὅσω κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια.

If Christ's Body were corporally present, it is not conceivable, what better Oblation than that we could present, no more than of what other Oblation this should be only a Type and Shadow.

Oecumenius (p) upon those words, *Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of Faith,* says thus: *Seeing there remains nothing visible, neither the Temple, that is Heaven, nor the High Priest, that is Christ, nor the Sacrifice, that is his Body; it remains that we have need of Faith.*

(p) *In Heb.* 10. *v.* 22.
Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ λοιπὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ὁρατὸν οὐδὲν, οὔτε ὁ ναὸς, τουτέστιν ὁ οὐρανὸς, οὔτε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, τουτέστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, οὔτε ἡ θυσία, τουτέστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, χρεία λοιπὸν πίστεως.

I shewed before, that the *Fathers* never make Christ's Body *invisible*, but only from its *distance* and *absence*: And so it must be understood here, that he and his Body, the Priest and the Sacrifice are *invisible*, being both in Heaven, at that distance which makes Heaven it self and its Inhabitants *invisible* to us; and therefore he recommends *Faith*, which can only make them present to us.

Author imperfecti Operis in Matthæum (q), (among the Works of *Chrysostome* in Latin) has this Saying: *If therefore it*

(q) *Hom.* 11. Si ergo vasa

ſanctificata, ad privatos uſus transferre ſic periculoſum eſt, *in quibus non eſt verum corpus Chriſti, ſed myſterium corporis ejus continetur*; quanto magis vaſa corporis noſtri, quæ ſibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare Diabolo agendi in eis quod vult.

it be ſo dangerous a thing, to turn the Sanctified Veſſels to private Uſes, in which is not the true Body of Chriſt, but only the Myſtery of his Body is contained therein; *how much more as to the Veſſels of our Body, which God has prepared for himſelf to dwell in, we ought not to give place to the Devil to act in them what he pleaſes.*

One may truſt an Adverſary as to his Opinion of what makes againſt him; Theſe Words were look'd upon as ſo conſiderable an Objection, that an Attempt to corrupt them was practiſed long ago. The Learned Archbiſhop *Uſher* (in the Preface of his Anſwer to the Jeſuit's Challenge) has obſerv'd, That thoſe words [*in quibus non eſt verum corpus Chriſti, ſed myſterium corporis ejus continetur*] were left out wholly, in an Edition at *Antwerp*, 1537. and at *Paris*, 1543. and in another at *Paris, apud Audoenum Parvum*, 1557. Dr. *James* (in his Corruption of True Fathers, *p.* 53.) ſays, Thoſe words are found in all the ancient Copies at *Oxford*, as Archbiſhop *Uſher* ſays they were extant in the ancienter Editions, as in 1487. And I my ſelf have ſeen one *Paris Edition*, even in the Year 1536. (*apud Claud. Chevallonium*) where thoſe words are extant. So that I conclude, That the *Antwerp* Edition firſt mentioned (*apud Joan. Steelſium*, 1537.) was the firſt that made the Alteration. But then I further obſerve, That in the large *Paris Edition* in Latin of S. *Chryſoſtome*, 1588. which I have by me, thoſe words are inſerted indeed in the Text, but incloſed within two Brakets, with this Note in the Margin, [*Hæc in quibuſdam exemplaribus deſunt,*] which is very fine work, when they themſelves had omitted them in the forenamed Prints.

They have plaid the ſame Prank with the ſame Author, in another of his Homilies, (*viz. Hom.* 19.) whoſe Words were not favourable to the Real Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt. The words are theſe.

Sed forte dices, quomodo dicere illum poſſum, non eſſe Chriſtianum, quem video Chriſtum confitentem, altare habentem, *Sacrificium panis & vini offerentem*, baptizantem, &c.

Perhaps thou wilt object, How can I ſay that he is not a Chriſtian, whom I ſee confeſſing Chriſt, having an Altar, offering the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, *baptizing*, &c.

In the *Paris Edition apud Audoenum Parvum*, An.

An. 1557. as Dr. *James* Notes, thoſe words, [*Sacrificium panis & vini*] are changed into theſe, [*Sacrificium corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti.*] The *Paris* Edition of 1588. (before mentioned) tho' it had more Conſcience than to inſert this Change into the Text, yet ſo far complied with the Cheat, as to put in the Margin [alias, *Sacrificium corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti.*]

If this Trade had gone on ſucceſsfully, they might have had in time a *Conſent of Fathers* on their ſide; but it can never be without it.

I will conclude this Particular with one Obſervation more, of what the Reader may find at large diſcourſed of, in a late Learned Diſſertation of Monſieur *Allix* (*r*), upon occaſion of an Epiſtle of S. *Auſtin* to *Conſentius*, who enquired of him, *Whether now the Body of Chriſt has Bones and Blood?* The very reading of that 146th Epiſtle of S. *Auſtin*, wherein he plainly, in his Anſwer to that Queſtion, betrays his doubting of it, as well as in other of his Works; his diſtinguiſhing betwixt Chriſt's having a true Body after his Reſurrection, and his having Fleſh and Blood; the Teſtimonies there of other of the *Ancients*, eſpecially of *Origen* and his Followers, that ſeem plainly to make both the glorified Body of Chriſt, and alſo of Believers, to be of another Compoſition than that of proper Fleſh and Blood; theſe, I ſay, are a Demonſtration, that the *Ancient Fathers* did not believe any Preſence of true Fleſh and Blood to be now in the Euchariſt.

(*r*) *Diſſert. de Sanguine D. N. Jeſu Chriſti ad Epiſt.* 146. *S. Auguſtini.* Utrum nunc corpus Domini oſſa & ſanguinem habeat.

Neither do I think the Anſwer given to this Diſſertation by *Monſieur Boileau*, Dean of *Sens* (*s*), to be a ſatisfactory one in this Particular. For tho' I ſhould grant (which yet I ſee not ſufficiently cleared by him) that generally the *Fathers*, and S. *Auſtin* alſo, did believe, that Chriſt had a Body, after the Reſurrection, of the ſame Subſtance, tho' differing in Qualities, from what he had before; yet there are Three things that he has by no means ſaid any thing material to, in his Anſwer.

(*s*) *Diſquiſit. Theolog. de Sangu. Corporis Chriſti poſt reſurrectionem.*

1. That he has given no Account of S. *Auſtin*'s ſtudious declining to determine any thing in particular about the

Blood of Chriſt, when he had never ſo fair an occaſion to do it; but waves this always, even where he ſeems, as he do's in his *Retractations*, to determine for his having palpable Fleſh and Bones.

2. Why S. *Auſtin* ſhould ever at all doubt or heſitate about this Matter of Chriſt's Blood after his Reſurrection, is unconceivable, if he, with the reſt of the *Fathers*, had ſuch a conſtant Belief of its Preſence in the Euchariſt, as the *Romaniſts* affirm.

3. That tho' the *Fathers* uſe the Argument of the Euchariſt to prove the Truth of Chriſt's Body, yet none ever urged *Origen* or his *Followers* with an Argument from thence, to confute their Opinions, differing from the pretended common Sentiments about the Body and Blood of Chriſt, by what lay ſo plainly before them, of his Body and Blood being in the Euchariſt, if they had believed it. But I refer the Reader to *Monſieur Allix* his Diſſertation, before-named, wherein he may find abundant Satisfaction in theſe Matters; and alſo will ſee how ſadly the *Romaniſts* are put to it, to anſwer the Difficulties about the Blood of Chriſt, which they pretend to ſhew in ſo many Churches, and is produced in ſuch Quantities, that may well cauſe a new Doubt, Whether if his Reſurrection-Body have any Blood in it, we muſt not ſuppoſe it to be of a *new Creation*, ſince what was in his Body when he died, cannot ſuffice to furniſh more Blood, if ſo much, as their Vials and Glaſſes are filled withal.

CHAP. X.

The Tenth Difference.

The Fathers aſſert poſitively, that the ſubſtance of the Elements remain after Conſecration; that Bread and Wine are taken, eaten and drunk in the Sacrament: which all that believe Tranſubſtantiation muſt deny.

WE have ſeen before that the *Fathers* ſay plainly, that it was Bread which Chriſt called his Body, when he bleſſed it. Now we ſhall ſee, that the Fathers are as poſitive, that after Conſecration, and the change made by it, yet ſtill the Bread and Wine remains.

I begin with that famous Teſtimony of S. *Chryſoſtome* againſt the *Apollinarians*; produced firſt by *P. Martyr*; by ſome of our Adverſaries charged upon him as his Forgery, becauſe it was ſo full againſt them; by others ſhifted off to another *John of Conſtantinople*, and denied to be S. *Chryſoſtome's*; but vindicated for his, by the Learned *Bigotius*, who had tranſcribed it out of the *Florentine* Library of S. *Mark's* Monaſtery, and prepared it for the Preſs, in his Edition of *Palladius*; then ſuppreſſed by ſome Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, and the printed leaves taken out of the Book; but now lately recovered and publiſhed to their ſhame. A paſſage of which (the ſubject of this great conteſt) I ſhall here ſet down.

See *Append. to the Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, p. 142, 143, *&c.*

Chriſt is both God and Man: God, for that he is impaſſible, Man for that he ſuffered. One Son, one Lord, he the ſame without doubt, having one Dominion, one power of two united natures: not that theſe (natures) are conſubſtantial, ſeeing each of them do's retain without confuſion its own properties, and being two are inconfuſed in him. *For as* (in the Euchariſt) *before the Bread is conſecrated, we call it Bread, but when the grace of God by the Prieſt has conſecrated it, it has no longer the name of Bread,*

Deus & homo Chriſtus: Deus propter impaſſibilitatem, Homo propter Paſſionem. Unus Filius, unus Dominus, idem ipſe proculdubus unitarum naturarum unam dominationem, unam poteſtatem poſſidens, etiamſi non conſubſtantiales exiſtunt, & unaquæq; in commixtam proprietatis conſervat agnitionem, propter hoc quod inconfuſa ſunt, [duo] dico. *Sicut enim antequam ſanctificetur Panis, Panem nominamus, divina*

autem illum Sanctificante gratiâ, mediante ſacerdote, liberatus eſt quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus eſt dominici corporis appellatione, etiamſi natura panis in ipſo permanſit, & non duo corpora, ſed unum corpus filii prædicatur. Sic & hic Divinâ ἑνώσει, id eſt, inundante corporis naturâ, unum filium, unam perſonam, utraq; hæc fecerunt. Agnoſcendum tamen natura, ſed in duabus perfectis.

Bread, but is counted worthy to be called the Lord's Body, altho' the nature of Bread remains in it, and we do not ſay there are two Bodies, but one Body of the Son. So here, the divine nature being joined to the (*humane*) Body, they both together make one Son, one Perſon; but yet they muſt be acknowledged to remain without confuſion, and after an indiviſible manner, not in one nature only, but in two perfect natures.

inconfuſam & indiviſibilem rationem, non in unâ ſolâ

Another remarkable Teſtimony, is in *Theodoret*'s *Dialogues*; ſome part of which I hope the Reader will not think it tedious to be inſerted here, ſince by obſerving the thread of his Diſcourſe, he will ſee his undoubted ſenſe to be, that the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine remain in the Euchariſt, and the change is by *addition* not *annihilation*; and I will add his Greek where it is needful.

Dial. I. *Orthodoxus.* Do you not know that God called his Body Bread? *Eranniſtes.* I know it. *Orth.* Elſewhere alſo he calleth his Fleſh Wheat. *Eran.* I know that alſo. *Unleſs a Corn of Wheat fall into the ground and die*, &c. *Orth.* But in the deſivery of the myſteries, he called the Bread his Body, and that which is mixed (viz. *Wine and Water in the Cup*) Blood. *Eran.* He did ſo call them. *Orth.* But that which is his Body by nature (χῦ φύσει τὸ σῶμα) is alſo to be called his Body, and his Blood (viz. *by nature*) Blood. *Eran.* It is confeſs'd.

Τῷ ιδίῳ σώματι τὸ τῦ συμβόλε τίθεσαν ὄνομα, τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τῦ σώματος.

Orth. But our Saviour changed the names, *and on his Body he impoſed the name of the ſymbol (or ſign) and on the ſymbol he put the name of his body*; And ſo having called himſelf a Vine, he called the Symbol Blood. *Eran.* Very right. But I have a mind to know the reaſon of this change of names. *Orth.* The ſcope is manifeſt to thoſe that are initiated in Divine things. For he would have thoſe that participate the divine myſteries, *not to attend to the nature of thoſe things that are ſeen, but upon the changing of the names, to believe the change that is made by grace.* For he that called his Body, that is ſo

Μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλεπομένων προσέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀναλλαγὴν, πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγενημένῃ μεταβολῇ.

by

by nature, Wheat and Bread, and again termed himſelf a Vine, *he honoured the viſible Symbols with the appellation of his Body and Blood, not altering nature, but to nature adding grace.*

Οὕτω τὰ ὁραθέντα σύμβολα τῷ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλών, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προσθείς.

Proceed we now to the next Dialogue.

Orth. The myſtical Symbols offered to God by the Prieſts, pray tell me what are they ſigns of? *Eran.* Of the Lords Body and Blood. *Orth.* Of his Body truly or not truly ſuch? *Era.* Of that which is truly (*his Body*). *Orth.* Very right. For there muſt be an original of an Image (τὸ εἰκὸς ἀρχέτυπον) for Painters imitate nature, and draw the Images of viſible things. *Era.* True. *Orth.* If then the divine myſteries are *Antitypes of a true Body*, then the Lords Body is a true Body ſtill, not changed into the nature of the Deity, but filled with Divine Glory. *Era.* You have ſeaſonably brought in the Diſcourſe of the Divine Myſteries; for thereby I will ſhew that the Lords Body is changed into another Nature. Anſwer therefore my Queſtion. *Orth.* I will. *Era.* What call you the Gift that is offered before the Prieſts Invocation? *Orth.* I may not openly declare it, for perhaps ſome here preſent may not be initiated. *Era.* Anſwer then Ænigmatically. *Orth.* I call it the food that is made of a certain grain. *Era.* How call you the other Symbol? *Orth.* By a common name that ſignifies a kind of drink. *Era.* But how do you call it after Conſecration? *Orth.* The Body of Chriſt, and the Blood of Chriſt. *Era.* And do you believe you partake the Body and Blood of Chriſt? *Orth.* Yes, I believe it. *Era.* As then the Symbols of Chriſts Body and Blood are one thing before the Prieſts Invocation, but after the Invocation, are changed and become another thing; ſo the Lords Body, after his Aſſumption, is changed into a Divine Eſſence. *Orth.* You are caught in a Net of your own weaving. *For after ſanctification, the myſtical Symbols do not depart from their own nature; for they remain ſtill in their former ſubſtance, and figure and form, and may be ſeen and touched juſt as before. But they are underſtood to be that which they are made, and are believed and venerated, as being thoſe things they are believed to be.*

Dial. 2.

Τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπα.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἔτι τὴν προτέραν οὐσίαν, καὶ τὸν σχῆμα καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν, καὶ ὁρατὰ, καὶ ἁπτὰ, ὅια καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ γέγονε, καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται.

How

How shamefully Mr. *Sclater* has attempted to pervert these last words of *Theodoret*, he has been told sufficiently by his *Answerer*.

The next Testimony is of *Gelasius* (*t*) Bishop of *Rome*. *The Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ which we take, are surely a divine thing; for which reason we become by them partakers of the Divine nature; and yet the substance or nature of Bread and Wine do's not cease to be; and indeed the Image and likeness of the Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries: therefore it appears plainly enough to us, that we ought to think that of our Lord, which we profess and celebrate and receive in his image; that as they* (*viz.* the Elements) *pass into that Divine substance, the H. Spirit effecting it, their nature still remaining in its own property; so that principal mystery whose efficiency and virtue these* (the Elements) *truly represent to us, remains one entire and true Christ; those things of which he is compounded* (*viz.* the two natures) *remaining in their properties.*

Ephrem Antiochenus (*u*) treating of the two Natures (which he calls palpable and impalpable, visible and invisible) united in Christ, adds, *Thus the Body of Christ which is received by the faithful, do's not depart from its sensible substance, and yet remains unseparated from the intellectual grace. So Baptism becoming wholly spiritual and one, it preserves its own sensible substance, I mean Water, and do's not lose what it is made to be.*

(*t*) *De duabus naturis in Christo.* Certè Sacramenta quæ sumimus, corporis & sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ; & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini; & certè Imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus & sumimus; ut sicut in hanc, sc. in Divinam transeunt Spiritu S. perficiente substantiam, permanente tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam Virtutemq; veraciter repræsentant, ex quibus constat propriè permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumq; permanere.

(*u*) *Apud Photii Biblioth. cod.* 229. Οὕτω καὶ τὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται, καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρετον μένει χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα καὶ πνευματικὸν ὅλον γενόμενον καὶ ἓν ὑπάρχον, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας, τοῦ ὕδατος λέγω, διασώζει, καὶ ὃ γέγονεν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν.

Our Adversaries, to testify the respect they have for the Fathers, when they do not speak as they would have them, they try to make them speak so as no Body shall understand their true sense. And as the *Putney Convert* did by *Theodoret*, so the Jesuit *Andr. Schottus* (not for want of skill, but honesty) has dealt with this of *Ephrem*, making it, by his translation, obscure, or rather unintelligible nonsense. For the first

first words [τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται] he translates [sensibilis essentiæ non cognoscitur, *it is not known of a sensible nature,*] and the other expression about Baptism [καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας, τοῦ ὕδατος λέγω, διασώζει] he turns it thus. [Hocq; substantiæ sensibilis proprium est per aquam, inquam, servat. *And this is the property of sensible substance, it keeps, I say, by Water.*] A good Man cannot take more pains to find out Truth than this Man do's that it may be lost.

The next Testimony, is of *Facundus*, (x) the African Bishop. Christ vouchsafed to receive the Sacrament of Adoption, both when he was Circumcised and when he was Baptized: and the Sacrament of Adoption may be called Adoption, just as we call the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, *which is in the Consecrated Bread and Cup*, his Body and Blood. Not that properly Bread is his Body, and the Cup his Blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of his Body and Blood. *Hence it is, that our Lord himself called the Bread and Cup he blessed, and gave to his Disciples, his Body and Blood.*

(x) *Lib. 9. defens. 3. capit. cap. 5.* Sacramentum adoptionis suscipere dignatus est Christus, & quando circumcisus est & quando baptizatus est: & potest Sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari, sicut Sacramentum corporis & sanguinis ejus *quod est in pane & poculo consecrato*, corpus ejus & sanguinem dicimus; non quod propriè corpus ejus sit panis, & poculum sanguis, sed quod in se mysterium corporis sanguinisq; contineant. *Hinc & ipse Dominus benedictum panem & calicem, quem discipulis tradidit, corpus & sanguinem suum vocavit.*

Nothing can be more positive than these five Testimonies, that the Bread and Wine remain in their substance after Consecration. And I cannot but here add the remarkable Confession of an Adversary, concerning two of them.

For thus *Card. Alan* (y) says, *Concerning these two*, Gelasius *and* Theodoret, *I readily persuade my self, that they are the only persons in all Antiquity* (tho' I have already produced three more of their mind) *who inclined to that, which was afterwards a common errour, so to defend the true Conversion of Bread, that they granted the matter of the Element to remain, as they saw it did in all other natural transmutations.*

(y) *De Euchar. Sacram. l. 1. c. 35.* De duobus, Gelasio & Theodoreto, facilè mihi persuadeo, eos solos esse ex omni Antiquitate, qui inclinaverunt in communem posteà multorum errorem, ut ita defenderent veram conversionem panis, ut materiam Elementi, sicut in cæteris naturalibus transmutationibus fieri videbant, relictam esse concederent, *&c.*

But we will try whether the reſt of the Fathers did not alſo ſpeak the ſame thing.

Juſtin Martyr (z) ſpeaking of the oblation of fine Flour for thoſe that were cleanſed from Leproſy, ſays, *It was a type of the Bread of the Euchariſt, which our Lord J. Chriſt commanded us to make in memory of his paſſion.* What *we make* (as was ſhow'd, *cap.* 8. *obſerv.* 7.) can be only Bread, not Chriſts Body in a proper ſenſe.

Again (*a*) telling us of the Biſhops praying and giving thanks over the Elements, he adds, *that the Deacons give to every one preſent leave to take of the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt.*

That this was his ſenſe appears further, by another Character he gives of it in the ſame place, when he calls it *Food by which our Fleſh and Blood by a change are nouriſhed.*

What he ſays in another place (*b*) of Chriſtians remembring their Lords Paſſion *by their dry and wet food*, can agree only to Bread and Wine, which therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to remain.

S. *Irenæus* (*c*) aſſerts with *Juſtin*, that the Bread and Cup of the Euchariſt is that, *by which the ſubſtance of our Fleſh is nouriſhed and conſiſts.*

In another place (*d*) he not only ſays, *that our Fleſh is nouriſhed by the Body and Blood of our Lord*, but adds, *As the Bread that is from the Earth, perceiving the Lords Invocation, is not now common Bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, an Earthly and an Heavenly*, &c. Tho' not *common Bread*, yet *Bread* ſtill, becauſe elſe it would conſiſt only of one thing, *viz.* Chriſts Body, and no *earthly thing* beſides.

Origen (*e*). *If every thing that enters into the mouth goes into the Belly and is caſt into the draught, then alſo the food that is ſanctified by the word of God and Prayer, as to the material part of it* (which can be nothing but Bread) *goes into the Belly,*

(z) *Dial. cum Tryph.* Τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν.

(a) *Apol.* 2. Οἱ διάκονοι δίδασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος —

Τρεφομένων ἐξ ὧν αἷμα καὶ σάρκας ἡμῶν μεταβολὴν τρέφουσι.

(b) *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 345. *Edit. Pariſ.* 1615. Τροφῆς ἀνθρώπων ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς.

(c) *L.* 5. *adv. hæreſ.* c. 2. Ex quibus augetur & conſiſtit carnis noſtræ ſubſtantia.

(d) *Ibid. l.* 4. *c.* 34. Carnem quæ à corpore Domini & ſanguine alitur.

Quemadmodum qui eſt à terra panis, percipiens invocationem Domini, jam non communis panis eſt, ſed Euchariſtia ex duabus rebus conſtans, terrena & cœleſti, &c.

(e) *Comm. in Matth.* 15. v. 15. p. 253. *Edit. Huet.* —Καὶ τὸ παραγόμενον βρῶμα εἰς λόγον ὅτι καὶ εἰς εὐχὴν θεοῦ, καθ' αὑτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται.

Belly,

Belly, &c. but in respect of the Prayer that is superadded — it becomes profitable, &c. Nor is it the matter of the Bread, but the word that is said over it that profits him that eats it not unworthily of the Lord.

Cyprian (f). We have found that it was a mixed Cup which our Lord offered, and that it was Wine which he called his Blood.

Macarius (g). In the Church is offered Bread and Wine, the Antitype of his Flesh and Blood, and they that are partakers of the visible Bread, do spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord.

Epiphanius (h) in a place I before cited, speaking of the Eucharist, says, *that the Bread is food, but the virtue that is in it, is for begetting Life.* It do's not cease to be food, tho' the quickening power is all from the grace and spirit of God in it.

S *Ambrose (i)* speaking of the Benediction of *Assur, Her Bread is fat,* &c. says, *Christ gave this Bread to the Apostles, to divide it among believing people, and now he gives it to us, whenas the Priest daily Consecrates with his words. This Bread is made to be the food of Saints.*

S. *Austin (k). We only call that the Body and Blood of Christ, which being taken from the fruits of the Earth, and Consecrated by mystical Prayer, we rightly receive to our spiritual health in memory of our Lords Passion. Which, when it is by the hands of men brought to that visible substance, is not sanctified to become so great a Sacrament, unless the spirit of God invisibly operate.*

Again *(l). Bread made for this purpose is consumed in receiving the Sacrament.* But it is neither received nor consumed till it be Consecrated, nor then but when eaten.

And again elsewhere *(m). The Eucharist is our daily Bread; but let us so receive it, that we may not only have refreshment for our bellies, but for our minds.*

Καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τῶν ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ὅτιν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τῶν κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν.

(f) *Epist. ad Cæcilium, l. 2. Ep. 3. alias 63.* Invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit.

(g) *Homil. 27.* Ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν αἵματος, καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τῶν φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ κυρίου ἐσθίουσι.

(h) *In Compend. fidei.* Καὶ βρῶσις μὲν ὁ ἄρτος, ἡ δὲ δύναμις ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ζωογόνησιν.

(i) *De Benedict. Patriarch. c. 9.* Hunc panem dedit Apostolis, ut dividerent populo credentium, hodiéq; dat nobis eum, quum ipse quotidiè sacerdos consecrat suis verbis. Hic panis factus est esca Sanctorum.

(k) *L. 3. de Trin. c. 4.* Corpus Christi & sanguinem dicimus illud tantum, quòd ex frugibus terræ acceptum & prece mysticâ consecratum, rite sumimus ad salutem spiritualem in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ Passionis; quod cùm per manus hominum ad illam visibilem speciem perducitur, non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum Sacramentum nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.

(l) *Idem Ibid. c. 10.* Panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo Sacramento consumitur.

(m) *Serm. 9. de divers. cap. 7.* Eucharistia panis noster quotidianus est; sed sic accipiamus illum, ut non solum ventre sed & mente reficiamur.

Upon this account it is, that looking upon the Sacrament as a refreshing food to our Bodies (as S. *Austin* here speaks) the *Ancients* believed, that by partaking of the Eucharist, they *Broke their Fasts*; this appears beyond all question in what *Tertullian* (*n*) says; who in resolving a doubt that troubled some minds, what they should do, when it happened that by a private vow they undertook a strict Fast (which obliged them not to take any refreshment till Evening) and this fell out upon a station day (which was usually *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*) when the Fast was ended at three a Clock by receiving the Communion. *Most think*, says he, *that on the station days they ought not to be present at the Prayers of the Sacrifices* (when the Eucharist was administred) *because the Fast was broken upon receiving the Lords Body.* *Tertullian* excepts not against this reason, but grants it, and finds out such an expedient as would be counted ridiculous in the *Roman* Church (where this of the Sacraments breaking the Fast is not believed) which is, to be present, and to take the Sacrament, and *reserve it* to be eaten at night.

(*n*) *Lib. de Orat. c. 14. ad finem.* Stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Dominico.

Accepto corpore Dominico & reservato, utrumque salvum est, & participatio Sacrificii & executio officii.

By receiving the Lords Body, says he, *and reserving it, both is salved, both the partaking of the Sacrifice* (*i. e.* of the Eucharist given at three a Clock) *and the execution of their duty* (he means of fasting till Evening, according to their Vow, and eating the Sacrament then, and not before.) But to proceed with our Testimonies.

Hesychius (*o*). *God therefore commanded Flesh to be eaten with Bread, that we might understand, that that mystery* (viz. the Eucharist) *was spoken of by him, which is both Bread and Flesh, as the Body of Christ the living Bread that descended from Heaven.* It can be only Bread and Flesh in *our way*, for in that of Transubstantiation it is only Flesh and no Bread.

(*o*) *In Levit. l. 2. c. 8.* Propterea carnes cum panibus comedi præcipiens, ut nos intelligeremus illud ab eo mysterium dici, quod simul panis & caro est, sicut Corpus Christi panis vivi qui de Cœlo descendit.

S. *Austin* (*p*). *Of the very Bread* Judas *and* Peter *both took a part, and yet what Society, what agreement, what part has* Peter *with* Judas?

(*p*) *Lib. cont. Donatist. c. 6.* De ipso pane & de ipsa Dominica manu, & *Judæ* Partem & *Petrus* accepit; & tamen quæ Societas, quæ consonantia, quæ pars *Petri* cum *Juda?*

Again

Again (*q*). *The Fathers did eat the ſame ſpiritual meat with us, but the corporal was different, they did eat Manna, we another thing* (he means Bread) —— *and they all drank the ſame ſpiritual drink, they one thing, we another, another as to the viſible ſubſtance, but in ſpiritual virtue ſignifying the ſame thing.*

(*q*) *Id Tract. in Joan.* 26. Patres manducaverunt ſpiritualem utiq; eandem (*eſcam*) nam corporalem alteram, quia illi Manna, nos aliud —— & omnes eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt, aliud illi, aliud nos, ſed ſpecie viſibili quidem, tamen hoc idem ſignificante virtute ſpirituali.

And again elſewhere (*r*). *Behold while Faith remains the ſame, the ſigns are varied. There* (in the Wilderneſs) *the Rock was Chriſt, to us that which is placed on the Altar* (viz. Bread) *is Chriſt*; *And they drank the Water that flowed from the Rock for a great Sacrament of the ſame Chriſt, what we drink the faithful know, (viz.* Wine) *if you regard the viſible ſubſtance it is another thing, if the ſpiritual ſignification they drank the ſame ſpiritual drink.*

(*r*) *Id. Tract.* 45. *in Joan.* Videte ergo, fide manente, ſigna variata. Ibi Petra Chriſtus, nobis Chriſtus quod in Altari ponitur; & illi pro magno Sacramento ejuſdem Chriſti biberunt aquam profluentem de Petra, nos quid bibamus norunt fideles. Si ſpeciem viſibilem intendas aliud eſt, ſi intelligibilem ſignificationem eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt.

Again in another place (*s*). *We have received to day the viſible food*; *but the Sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the Sacrament is another.*

(*s*) *Tract.* 26. *in Joan.* Nam & nos hodie accepimus viſibilem cibum; ſed aliud eſt Sacramentum, aliud eſt virtus Sacramenti.

That which he calls here *cibus viſibilis* (the viſible food) a little after S. *Auſtin* calls it *viſibile Sacramentum* (a viſible Sacrament) where he diſtinguiſhes this again from the *Virtus Sacramenti* (the Virtue of the Sacrament) ſo that the *viſible food*, and the *viſible Sacrament*, with him are the ſame.

I have already produced the Teſtimonies (*vid. chap.* 8. *Obſerv.* 5.) where the Fathers make what is diſtributed in the Euchariſt to be without Life or ſenſe; which can be true of nothing elſe but of the Bread and Wine. So that unleſs we make them diſtribute what they had not conſecrated, the Bread and Wine muſt remain after Conſecration.

The ſame is alſo evidently proved from another common aſſertion of the Fathers, *that Chriſt offered the ſame oblation with* Melchiſedek.

S. *Cyprian* (*t*). *Who was more a Prieſt of the moſt High God, than our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the ſame that* Melchiſedeck *had offered, that is Bread*

(*t*) *Lib.* 2. *Epiſt.* 3. Quis magis ſacerdos Dei ſummi, quam Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, qui Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchiſedec

obtulerat, id est panem & vinum, suum scilicet corpus & sanguinem?

Bread and Wine, to wit his Body and Blood? Which indeed the Wine and Bread was by *representation*, but if you understand this of *proper Flesh and Blood* offered in the Eucharist, then it is not the same oblation with that of *Melchisedeck*.

Isidore Peleusiota (u). Melchisedeck *performed his sacred Office in Bread and Wine, by which he foresignified the type of the divine mysteries.*

Eusebius (x). *For as he* (Melchisedeck) *being a Priest of the Gentiles never seems to have made use of Bodily Sacrifices, but blessed* Abraham *only in Bread and Wine. After the same manner also, first our Lord and Saviour himself, then all the Priests that derive from him, performing in all Nations their spiritual function according to the Ecclesiastical Sanctions, by Bread and Wine do express the mysteries of his Body and saving Blood,* Melchisedeck *having foreseen these things by a divine spirit, and having used before these images of future things.*

S. *Jerome* (y). Melchisedeck *by Bread and Wine, which is a simple and a pure Sacrifice, did dedicate Christs Sacrament.*

S. *Austin* (z). Melchisedeck, *bringing forth the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (i. e. *Bread and Wine*) *knew how to figure Christs Eternal Priesthood.*

Again (a) upon those words, *Thou art a Priest for ever*, &c. He adds, *Since now there is no where any Priesthood or Sacrifice, according to the Order of* Aaron; *and that is every where offered under Christ the Priest, which* Melchisedeck *brought forth when he blessed* Abraham.

In many other places S. *Austin* says the same.

Arnobius (b). *Christ by the mystery of Bread and Wine, is made a Priest for ever.*

S. *Chrysostom* (c). *Why did he say,* a Priest after the Order of Melchisedeck? *Even because of the mysteries, because he also brought out Bread and Wine to* Abraham.

(u) *Lib.* 1. *Epist.* 431. *ad Pallad.* Μελχισεδὲκ ἄρτῳ καὶ οἴνῳ ἱερατεύων, δι' ὧν τῶν θείων μυστηρίων προεσήμαινε τύπον.

(x) *Lib.* 5. *Dem. Evang. c.* 3. Ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος (Melchisedeck) ἱερεὺς ἐθνῶν τυγχάνων, οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται θυσίαις σωματικαῖς κεχρημένος, οἴνῳ δὲ μόνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ εὐλογῶν, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον, &c.

— οἴνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ, τοῦτε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος αἰνίττονται τὰ μυστήρια, τοῦ Μελχισεδὲκ ταῦτα πνεύματι θείῳ προτεθεωρηκότος, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ταῖς εἰκόσι προκεχρημένου.

(y) *Epist. ad Evagrium.* Melchisedec pane & vino simplici puroq; sacrificio, Christi dedicaverit Sacramentum.

(z) *Epist.* 95. Melchisedec prolato Sacramento cœnæ Dominicæ novit æternum ejus sacerdotium figurare.

(a) *L.* 17. *de civit. Dei, c.* 17. — Ex eo quod jam nusquam est Sacerdotium & Sacrificium secundum ordinem Aaron, & ubiq; offertur sub sacerdote Christo, quod protulit Melchisedec quando benedixit Abraham.

(b) *In Psal.* 109. Christus per mysterium panis & vini factus est sacerdos in æternum.

(c) *Comment. in Psal.* 110. vel 109. — καὶ διὰ τὰ μυστήρια, ὅτι κἀκεῖνος ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον προσήνεγκε τῷ Ἀβραάμ.

Isidore

Iſidore of Sevil (*d*). *Let us not offer the Victims of Beaſts according to* Aaron, *but let us offer in Sacrifice the oblation of Bread and Wine, that is the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood.*

(*d*) *In Geneſin cap.* 12. Non ſecundùm Aaron pecudum victimas, ſed oblationem panis & vini, id eſt, corporis & ſanguinis ejus Sacramentum in Sacrificium offeramus.

Bede (*e*). *Our Redeemer is therefore called a Prieſt, after the Order of Melchiſedeck, becauſe taking away the legal Sacrifices, he inſtituted the ſame kind of Sacrifice* (*viz.* Bread and Wine) *ſhould be offered under the N. Teſtament, for the myſtery of his Body and Blood.*

(*e*) *Hom. de* 55. *in Vigil. S. Jo. Bapt.* Redemptor noſter ideo ſacerdos eſſe dicitur ſecundùm Ordinem Melchiſedec, quia, ablatis victimis legalibus, idem ſacrificii genus in myſterium ſui corporis & ſanguinis in N. Teſtamento offerendum inſtituit.

What the Scriptures acquaint us with, that after the Bleſſing of the Bread, Chriſt brake it and gave it to his Diſciples, is alſo inſiſted on by the *Fathers* as done in the Euchariſt, in order to the diſtributing of it to the receivers.

But *Bellarmine* ſays expreſly (*f*). *That our breaking is not made for diſtribution, but to ſignify a certain myſtery.* Therefore in the *Roman Church*, that which they give in the Sacrament to the people is *whole*, and not *broken off* from any other thing. Wherein they differ from the *Fathers*, for their Euchariſt was what the Apoſtles call *breaking of Bread*, *Act.* 2. 46. and the Jeſuit *Lorinus* upon that place obſerves, that it was the manner of the Primitive Church, *to make one Loaf, and when they had conſecrated it, to break it into ſo many parts as there were Communicants, as Chriſt alſo did in his Supper.* And thus as it is 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. *There is one Bread*, &c. *and we being many are one Body*, for we all partake of *one Bread.*

(*f*) *L.* 1. *de Miſſa, c.* 27. Noſtra fractio non fit ad diſtribuendum, ſed ad certum myſterium ſignificandum.

Lorinus in Act. 2. *v.* 46. Panem unum conficere, atq; illum conſecratum in tot partes frangere, quot erant communicantes, ſicut & Chriſtus in cœna fecit.

This Fraction, tho' the *Fathers* expreſs it as if it were done to the *proper Body of Chriſt*, yet they mean it only of the *Bread* that *repreſents it:* and therefore that muſt remain, for there is nothing elſe to be broken.

When therefore S. *Chryſoſtome* (*g*) ſays, that upon the Croſs a Bone of him was not broken, *but what Chriſt did not ſuffer upon the Croſs, that he ſuffers in the oblation for thy ſake, and ſuffers himſelf to be broken, that he may fill us all.*

(*g*) *Hom.* 24. *in* 1 *Cor. Tom.* 3. *Edit. Savil. p.* 397. — Ἀλλ' ὅπερ οὐκ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τοῦτο πάσχει ὑπὲρ τῆς προσφορᾶς δι' σὲ, καὶ ἀνέχεται διακλώμενος ἵνα πάντας ἐμπλήσῃ.

This

This cannot be meant of any thing but what repreſents his Body torn and rent, *viz. Bread.*

So S. *Auſtin* (*b*) ſpeaks of that upon the Lords Table, which is bleſſed and ſanctified, *and broke in ſmall pieces to be diſtributed.* Which can be only *Bread.*

(*b*) *Epiſt.* 59. —— Et ad diſtribuendum comminuitur.

And this elſewhere (*i*) he expreſſes more plainly. *Paul*, ſays he, *broke Bread that night, as it is broken in the Sacrament of the Body of Chriſt.*

(*i*) *Epiſt.* 86. ··· Sicut frangitur in Sacramento Corporis Chriſti.

Again (*k*) S. *Auſtin* thus exhorts. *Let us eat Chriſt*; *he lives tho' eaten, for he aroſe tho' ſlain. Neither when we eat him, do we make parts of him*; *ſo indeed we do in the Sacrament, and the faithful know how they eat the Fleſh of Chriſt* (there.) *Every one takes a part*, &c.

(*k*) *Auguſt. apud Bedam in* 1 *Cor.* 11. Manducemus Chriſtum; vivit manducatus, quia ſurrexit occiſus: nec quando manducamus, partes de illo facimus, & quidem in Sacramento id fit; & norunt fideles quemadmodum manducent carnem Chriſti, unuſquiſq; accipit partem, *&c.*

This is a very remarkable Teſtimony, becauſe of the diſtinction he makes between Chriſt's *proper Body*, and *that* in the *Euchariſt*, affirming quite different things of them, as this of taking and eating a part, which is only true of the Bread. For as for the true Body of Chriſt, we are informed by another,

Chryſologus (*l*). *Chriſt cannot be eaten and divided. He is taken whole of Believers, he is received whole in the mouth of the heart.*

(*l*) *Serm.* 159. Non poteſt Chriſtus edi & dividi. Integer à credentibus ſumitur, integer in ore cordis recipitur.

I will conclude this Chapter with the ſayings of three great perſons among the *Fathers*, who poſitively aſſert what I have been proving, that the Bread and Wine remain in the Euchariſt.

S. *Chryſoſtom* (*m*). Who ſays expreſly, *When our Lord delivered the myſteries, he delivered Wine.*

(*m*) *Hom.* 83. *in Matth.* Ὅταν τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε.

S. *Auſtin* (*n*). *To eat Bread, is the Sacrifice of Chriſtians in the N. Teſtament.*

(*n*) *De Civ. Dei, lib.* 17. *cap.* 5. Manducare panem, eſt in N. Teſtamento ſacrificium Chriſtianorum.

Fulgentius (*o*). *Now*; *that is, in the time of the N. Teſtament, the Holy Catholick Church, throughout the whole Earth, do's not ceaſe to offer in Faith and Charity, the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to Chriſt, with the Father and H. Spirit, who have one Divinity together with him.*

(*o*) *De fide ad Petrum, cap.* 19. Chriſto nunc, id eſt, tempore N. Teſtamenti, cum Patre & Spiritu Sancto, cum quibus una eſt illi Divinitas, Sacrificium panis & vini in fide & charitate Sancta Eccleſia Catholica per univerſum orbem terræ offerre non ceſſat.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

The Eleventh Difference.

The Fathers make the Bread and Wine to be the Sacrament, Sign, Figure, Type, Antitype, Image, &c. *of Chriſts Body and Blood. They of the Church of* Rome, *make either the Accidents ſubſiſting without a Subject, or the Body of Chriſt latent under thoſe Accidents, to be the Sacrament, Sign, Figure,* &c. *and not the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, which they ſay is aboliſhed.* Therefore they have no Sacrament ſuch as the *Fathers* aſſert.

I Might give in here a very large Collection out of the Fathers, calling the Bread and Wine by all thoſe names above mention'd; but to avoid tedioufneſs, I ſhall only ſelect ſome few of them (enow to prove the Truth of what I have aſſerted) under the ſeveral heads.

S. *Ambroſe* (*p*). *It is the true Fleſh of Chriſt that was buried; therefore it* (*viz.* the Euchariſt) *is truly the Sacrament of his fleſh.*

S. *Auſtin* (*q*). *How is the Bread his Body, and the Cup, or what the Cup contains, his Blood? Theſe, Brethren, are therefore called Sacraments, becauſe in them we ſee one thing, and underſtand another.*

Again (*r*). *When the Lord came to the Supper, wherein he commended the Sacrament of his Body and Blood.*

Facundus (*s*). *Chriſts faithful ones, receiving the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, are rightly ſaid to receive his Body and Blood.* And he had ſaid before, *Not that the Bread is properly his Body, and the Cup his Blood, but becauſe they contain in them the myſtery of his Body and Blood.*

Iſidore (*t*) ſpeaking of the Bread and Wine, ſays, *Theſe two are viſible, but being ſanctified by the Holy Spirit they paſs into a Sacrament of his Divine Body.*

(*p*) *De iis qui initiant. c.* 9. Vera utiq; caro Chriſti, quæ crucifixa eſt, quæ ſepulta eſt, verè ergo carnis illius eſt Sacramentum.

(*q*) *Serm. ad recen. Batiſ.* Quomodo eſt panis corpus ejus, & calix, vel quod habet calix, ſanguis ejus? Iſta, fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in iis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur.

(*r*) *In Pſal.* 68. *conc.* 1. Cùm veniret Dominus ad cœnam, qua commendavit Sacramentum corporis & ſanguinis ſui.

(*s*) *Defenſ.* 3. *capit. l.* 9. Chriſti fideles Sacramentum corporis & ſanguinis ejus accipientes, corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti rectè dicuntur accipere. — non quod propriè corpus ejus ſit panis & poculum ſanguis, ſed quod in ſe myſterium corporis ſanguiniſq; contineant.

(*t*) *De Offic. Eccleſ. l.* 1. *c.* 18. Hæc duo ſunt viſibilia, ſanctificata autem per Spiritum Sanctum in Sacramentum Divini Corporis tranſeunt.

They call them also Symbols.

Origen (*u*). Having discoursed (as we heard before) of the Eucharist, concludes thus. *Thus much may suffice concerning the Typical and symbolical* Body. And distinguishes it from the word that was made Flesh, which he calls *true food.*

Eusebius (*x*). *Having received a command to celebrate the memory of this Sacrifice upon the Table, by the Symbols of his* Body *and saving* Blood, *according to the Ordinances of the N. Testament.*

Theodoret (*y*), not only in the large Testimony produced out of him in the last Chapter, calls the Bread and Wine the Symbols of Christs Body and Blood, but says thus elsewhere. *In the most H. Baptism we see a type of the resurrection, then we shall see the resurrection it self. Now we see the Symbols of the Lords* Body, *there we shall see the Lord himself.*

They call them Signs.

S. *Austin* (*z*). *Our Lord did not doubt to say,* This is my Body, *when he gave the sign of his* Body.

S. *Ambrose* (*a*) of the Bread. *Before the Benediction of the Heavenly words, another species is named, after the Consecration the* Body *of* Christ *is signified.*

S. *Cyprian* (*b*). *Neither can the* Blood *of* Christ, *whereby we are redeemed and quickned, be seen to be in the Cup, when Wine is wanting in the Cup, whereby the* Blood *of* Christ *is shown.* Speaking against those that used only *Water.*

Tertullian (*c*). *Neither did he reject* Bread, *whereby he represents his own* Body.

S. *Jerome* (*d*). Christ, says he, took Bread that comforts mans heart, and proceeded to the true Sacrament of the Passover, *That like as* Melchisedeck *the Priest of the High God had done, when he offered* Bread *and* Wine, *so he also might* represent *the truth of his* Body *and* Blood.

(*u*) *Comm. in Matth.* 15. Καὶ ταῦτα περὶ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος.

(*x*) *Dem. Evang. l.* 1. *cap.* 10. Τούτου τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος κατὰ θεσμοὺς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρειληφότες, &c.

(*y*) *Comm. in* 1 *Cor.* 13. Ἐν τῷ παναγίῳ βαπτίσματι τὸν τύπον ὁρῶμεν τῆς ἀναστάσεως, τότε δὲ αὐτὴν ὀψώμεθα τὴν ἀνάστασιν· Ἐνταῦθα τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ θεώμεθα σώματος, ἐκεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν ὀψώμεθα τὸν δεσπότην.

(*z*) *Contr. Adimant. c.* 12. Non dubitavit Dominus dicere hoc est corpus meum, cùm daret signum corporis sui.

(*a*) *De iis qui init. c.* 9. Ante benedictionem verborum Cœlestium alia species nominatur, post Consecrationem Corpus Christi significatur.

(*b*) Nec potest videri sanguis ejus quo redempti & vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quùm vinum desit calici, *quo Christi sanguis ostenditur. Epist. ad Cæcilium.*

—(*c*) *L.* 1. *adv. Marcion.* Nec panem reprobavit, quo ipsum Corpus suum repræsentat.

(*d*) *In Matth.* 26.
— Ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedec summi Dei sacerdos panem & vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoq; veritatem sui corporis & sanguinis repræsentaret.

It's

It's a very trifling objection that our Adversaries make both to this and the former Testimony in *Tertullian*, that the word *repræsentare* (to represent) signifies very often to *exhibit a thing*, and make it *present*; for tho' it should be granted, it would not help their cause, since they both say, that it is Bread that represents his Body, which therefore must remain, since that which is not cannot act any thing: but then I add, that tho' in some Cases to *represent* is to *exhibit*, yet never in the Case of *Sacraments* and *Signs*, for their Essence consists in signification, therefore their representation as Signs, must be to denote and show rather something absent which they represent, than to make it present.

They call them also Types.

Cyril of Jerus. (*e*). He bids us receive the Bread and Wine with all certainty, *as the Body and Blood of Christ: for in the Type of the Bread his Body is given to thee, and in the type of Wine his Blood.*

Greg. Nazianzen (*f*). *We shall receive the Passover now in a Type still, tho' more clear than that of the old Law (for the legal Passover, I am bold to say it, was an obscure Type of a Type) but within a while we shall receive it more perfect and more pure.*

S. *Jerome* (*g*) upon those words of *Jerem.* 31. *They shall flow unto the goodness of the Lord, for Wheat, and Wine and Oyl,* adds, *Of which is made the Lords Bread, and the Type of his Blood is filled, and the Blessing of Sanctification is shown.*

Theodoret (*h*) calls the Eucharist, *The venerable and saving Type of Christs Body.*

(*e*) *Catech. Mystag.* 4.
— Ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου δίδοταί σοι σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδοται τὸ αἷμα.

(*f*) *In Pasch. Orat.* 43. *Ed. Basil. Gr.* Μεταλημψώμεθα δὲ τὴν πάσχα νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τὴν παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον (τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν Πάσχα, τολμῶ δὲ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος) μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον τελειότερον καὶ καθαρώτερον.

(*g*) *In Jerem.* 31.

— De quo conficitur panis Domini, & sanguinis ejus impletur typus, & benedictio sanctificationis ostenditur.

(*h*) *Dialog.* 3.
— Τούτου τύπον σεπτὸν καὶ σωτήριον.

Another name is Antitypes, signifying the same with the former.

Author Constitutionum (*i*) under the name of *Clemens Roman. Christ delivered to us the mysteries which are antitypes of his precious Body and Blood.*

(*i*) *Lib.* 5. *cap.* 13.
— Παραδίδους ἡμῖν τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τῆς τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος.

(k) *Lib.* 7. *c.* 26.

—— καὶ τῶν τιμίου σώματος τοῦ καὶ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελοῦμεν.

Again (*k*). O our Father, we give thee thanks for the precious Blood of Jesus Christ shed for us, *and for his precious Body of which we celebrate these Antitypes.*

(*l*) *In Proverb.* 9. *citat. in Conc. Nic.* 2. *Act.* 6. Τὰ δὲ φησὶ διὰ τῶν οἴνου καὶ τῶν ἄρτου τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῶν σωματικῶν τῶν Χριστοῦ κηρύττει μελῶν.

Eustathius of Antioch (*l*), expounding those words, *Eat my Bread, and Drink the Wine that I have mingled*, says, *He speaks these things, by Bread and Wine preaching the Antitypes of Christs Bodily Members.*

(*m*) *Homil.* 27. Ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν αἵματος.

Macarius (*m*). *In the Church is offered Bread and Wine, the Antitype of Christs Flesh and Blood.*

(*n*) *Orat.* 11.

Εἴπου τί τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῶν τιμίου σώματος ἢ τῶν αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν, &c.

Greg. Nazianzin (*n*) telling the story how his Sister *Gorgonia* was Cured of a desperate Malady, by applying the Sacrament mixed with tears to her Body, he expresses it thus. *Whatsoever of the Antitypes of the precious Body and Blood of Christ her hand had treasured up*, &c.

(*o*) *Catech. Mystag.* 5. Γευόμενοι γὰρ, οὐκ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου κελεύονται γεύσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀντιτύπου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Cyril of Jerus. (*o*). *When they tast, they are not required to tast Bread and Wine* (i. e. not these alone) *but the Antitype of Christs Body and Blood.*

(*p*) *Dialog.* 2. Τοῦ ὄντως σώματος ἀντίτυπα.

Theodoret (as we heard before (*p*)) calls the Divine Mysteries, *the Antitypes of the True Body of Christ.*

(*q*) *Recapit. in fine Dialog.* 3. —— Τοῦ δὴ χάριν μεταλαμβάνουσι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ σώματος, περιττὸς γὰρ ὁ τύπος ἀνῃρημένης τῆς ἀληθείας.

And in another place (*q*) he says, *If the Lords Flesh be changed into the Nature of the Divinity, wherefore do they receive the Antitypes of his Body, for the Type is superfluous* (you see Type and Antitype signify the same) *when the Truth is taken away.*

(*r*) *Citante Bulingero adv. Casaub.* p. 166.

—— Οὐδὲ δὺ σώματα, αὐτὸ τὸ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὄν, καὶ ὁ τούτου ἀντίτυπος ἄρτος ἐν ἐκκλησίαις παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων διαδιδόμενος τοῖς πιστοῖς.

Theodotus of Antioch (*r*) says, *As the King himself and his Image are not two Kings, neither are these two Bodies*, viz. *The Body of Christ personally existing in the Heavens, and the Bread, the Antitype of it, which is delivered in the Church by the Priests to the Faithful.*

They call it a Figure.

(*s*) *Lib.* 3. *adv. Maricion.* Panem corpus suum appellans, ut hinc etiam intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse.

Tertullian (*s*). *Calling Bread his Body, that thou mayst thence understand, that he gave to the Bread the Figure of his Body.*

Again

Again (*t*). *The Bread which he took and diſtributed to his Diſciples, he made it his Body, ſaying,* This is my Body, *that is, the Figure of my Body.*

Ephrem Syrus (*u*). *Diligently conſider, how Chriſt taking Bread in his hands, bleſſed and brake it, for a figure of his immaculate Body, and alſo bleſſed and gave the Cup to his Diſciples, for a figure of his precious Blood.*

S. *Auſtin* (*x*). *He admitted* Judas *to the Banquet, in which he commended and delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his Body and Blood.*

Bede (*y*) alſo ſays the ſame, *Neither did Chriſt exclude* Judas *from the moſt holy Supper, in which he delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his moſt holy Body and Blood.*

And elſewhere (*z*), *Chriſt inſtead of the Fleſh or Blood of a Lamb, ſubſtituting the Sacrament in the Figure of Bread and Wine, ſhowed that it was he, to whom the Lord ſware,* Thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of *Melchiſedeck.*

(*t*) *Lib.* 4. *adv. Marcion. c.* 40. Acceptum panem & diſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, *hoc eſt corpus meum,* dicendo, id eſt, figura corporis mei.

(*u*) *Tract. de nat. dei curioſè non ſcrutanda.* Diligenter intuere, quomodo in manibus panem accipiens, benedixit & fregit in figuram immaculati corporis ſui, calicemq; in figuram pretioſi ſanguinis ſui benedixit deditq; diſcipulis ſuis.

(*x*) *In Pſal.* 3. Adhibuit (Judam) ad convivium, in quo corporis & ſanguinis ſui figuram diſcipulis commendavit & tradidit.

(*y*) *In Pſal.* 3. Nec à Sacratiſſimâ cœna, in quâ figuram Sacroſancti corporis ſanguiniſq; ſuis diſcipulis tradidit, ipſum (ſc. *Judam*) excluſit.

(*z*) *In Luc.* 22. Pro agni carne vel ſanguine ſuæ carnis ſanguiniſq; Sacramentum in panis & vini figurâ ſubſtituens, ipſum ſe eſſe monſtraret, cui juravit Dominus, *Tu es ſacerdos in æternum ſecundùm Ordinem Melchiſedec.*

The words of the *Ambroſian* Office are very remarkable, as they are ſet down by the Author of the Book of Sacraments under his name, where he asks this Queſtion.

(*a*) *Wouldſt thou know that the Euchariſt is Conſecrated by Heavenly words? Hear then what the words are.* The Prieſt ſays, Make this oblation to us allowable, rational, acceptable, which is *the Figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,* &c.

(*a*) *Lib.* 4. *de Sacram. c.* 5. *in initio.* Vis ſcire quia verbis cœleſtibus conſecratur? Accipe quæ ſint verba. Dicit ſacerdos, *Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem aſcriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem,* quod eſt Figura corporis & ſanguinis Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, &c.

This Prayer thus expreſſed in this Office, ſignifies more than all that can be cited againſt us out of theſe Books; and indeed they were too plain to be continued, when Tranſubſtantiation was believed in the *Roman Church*, and therefore in the preſent Canon of the Maſs they are changed, and inſtead of *Figura Corporis,* they now read, *Fiat nobis Corpus,* &c.

Laſtly,

Lastly, *The Fathers call the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, the Image of Christs Body.*

(*b*) *Lib.* 8. *Demon. Evang.*

—— Τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος ποιεῖσθαι παρακελευόμενος.

Eusebius (*b*). Christ, says he, delivered to his Disciples the Symbols of his Divine Oeconomy, *requiring them to make an Image of his Body.*

(*c*) *Tract. de duabus Naturis.* Certe Imago & Similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus & sumimus, *&c.*

Gelasius (*c*). *Surely the Image and similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is evidently therefore shown to us, that we must think of our Lord Christ the same, which we profess, celebrate and take in his Image,* &c.

(*d*) *Comm. in* 49 *Genes.*

Procopius of Gaza (*d*) expounding these words spoken of Juda, *His Eyes shall be red with Wine, and his Teeth white with Milk* (Gen. 49. 12.) he applies it to the Eucharist, and that gladness which is obtain'd by the mystical Wine which Christ first tasted, and bad his Disciples take and drink; and the Milk may signify the purity of the mystical food, *for he gave the Image of his own Body to his Disciples, no longer requiring the bloody Sacrifices of the Law, and by the white teeth he denoted the purity of the Bread by which we are nourished.*

Παρέδωκε εἰκόνα τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος μαθηταῖς, μηκέτι τὰς νομικὰς καὶ δι' αἱμάτων θυσίας προσιέμενος. Τὸ τοίνυν ἄρτου τὸ καθαρὸν τῆς τροφῆς διὰ τῶν λευκῶν ὀδόντων ἐδήλωσε.

(*e*) *Dialog.* 3.

—— Ποίας σαρκὸς, ἢ τινὸς σώματος, ἢ ποίου αἵματος εἰκόνας διδοὺς, ἐνετέλλετο τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖσθαι.

Author Dialog. adv. Marcionitas inter opera Originis (*e*). If Christ, as the *Marcionists* say, was without Flesh and without Blood, *of what Flesh, or of what Body or Blood did he give the Images, and commanded his Disciples to make a remembrance of him by?*

(*f*) *In Concil. Nicen.* 2. *Act.* 6.

—— Τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα.

—— Οὕτω καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα ὕλην ἐξαίρετον, ἤγουν ἄρτου οὐσίαν, προσέταξεν προσφέρεσθαι, μὴ χρηματίζουσαν ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν, ἵνα μὴ εἰδωλολατρεία παρεισαχθῇ.

—— Τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρ-

Synodus Constantinop. an. 754. (*f*). The Fathers there call the Eucharist, the *true Image of Christ*, and say afterwards —— *Christ commanded us to offer an Image, a chosen matter, to wit, the substance of Bread, not having an humane Figure, lest Idolatry should be introduced.*

And again. *It pleased him, that the Bread of the Eucharist, being the true Image of his natural Flesh*

Fleſh ſhould be made a Divine Body, being ſanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, the Prieſt which makes the oblation intervening to make it holy, which before was common.

κὰι, διὰ τ τῦ ἁγίυ πνεύμα]Θ ἐπιφοίτησιν ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα δεδεῖκται γινεσθ, μετα]ὺ]Θ τῦ ἐν μέσῳ ἐλθεῖν τὸν τῦ κοινῦ ποιῆσ τὸ ἅγιον τῷ ἀναφορὰν ποιμένι ἱερέως.

He that would have more Teſtimonies of this kind, may conſult Monſieur *Blondel*, in his *Eſclairciſſements ſur l' Euchariſtie*, cap. 4. prop. 8.

The Fathers alſo make two or three Remarks, which add further ſtrength to this Argument.

Firſt Remark. *They not only make Bread and Wine to be the Image, Type, Figure, &c. of Chriſts Body Crucified; but they alſo aſſert, that an Image, Figure, &c. cannot be the thing it ſelf, of which it is an Image and Figure.*

Tertullian (g). *The Image cannot be every ways adequate to the Truth; for it is one thing to be according to Truth, another to be the Truth it ſelf.*

Athanaſius (b). *That which is like to another is not that thing it ſelf to which it is like.*

Hilary (i). *Neither is any one an Image of himſelf.*

S. *Ambroſe* (k). *None can ever have been an Image of himſelf.*

Gr. Nyſſen (l). *An Image would be no longer ſuch if it were altogether the ſame with that of which it is an Image.*

S. *Auſtin* (m). *What can be more abſurd, than to be called an Image with reſpect to ones ſelf.*

Gaudentius (n). *A Figure is not the Truth, but an imitation of the Truth.*

Theodoret (o). *An Image has the Figures and lines, not the things themſelves.*

Cyril of Alexand. (p). *A Type is not the Truth, but rather imports the ſimilitude of the Truth.*

Bertram (q). *A pledge and an Image are of another thing; that is, they do not look to themſelves, but to ſomething elſe.*

(g) *Cont. Marcion.* l. 2. c. 9. Imago veritati non uſquequaque adæquabitur, aliud enim eſt ſecundùm veritatem eſſe, aliud ipſam veritatem eſſe.

(h) *Contr. Hypocr. Milet.* Τὸ ὅμοιόν τινι, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο ᾧ ὅμοιόν.

(i) *De Synodis.* Neq; enim ſibi ipſi quiſquam imago eſt.

(k) *De fide* l. 1. *cap.* 4. Nemo poteſt ſibi ipſi imago fuiſſe.

(l) *De anima & reſurrect.* Οὐκ ἂν γὰρ ἔτι εἰκὼν, εἰ δ' ἀπόλυτον ἦν ταὐτὸν ἐκείνῳ.

(m) *De Trinit.* l. 7. c. 1. Quid abſurdius quàm Imaginem ad ſe dici?

(n) *In Exod. tract.* 2. Figura non eſt veritas, ſed imitatio veritatis.

(o) *In Dan.* l. 2. c 2. Ἡ εἰκὼν σύμαλα, ἃ περίγραμμαλα ἔχει.

(p) *In Amos.* cap. 6. Ὁ δὲ τύπ]Θ οὐκ ἀλήθεια, μᾶλλον δὲ μᾶλλον τ ἀληθείας εἰσάγει.

(q) *De corp. & ſang. Domini.* Pignus & Imago alterius rei ſunt, id eſt, non ad ſe, ſed ad aliud aſpiciunt.

This

(r) *In Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 6.*

This *Epiphanius* the Deacon (r) in the ſecond Council of *Nice* confeſſes, and therefore is fain to deny, that the Euchariſt is the *Image* or *Antitype* of Chriſts Body; For, ſays he, *If* (the Euchariſt) *be an Image of his Body, it cannot be the Divine Body it ſelf.*

Εἰ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.

(s) *De Orth. fide l. 4. c. 14.*

Damaſcen alſo (s) who was one of the firſt Innovators in the matter of the Euchariſt, denies, that the Bread and Wine are a Type or Figure of Chriſts Body and Blood, but the very Body and Blood it ſelf; and that when the Antients call them ἀντίτυπα Antitypes, they mean it is ſo before Conſecration of the Elements not after, which I have abundantly ſhowed, by foregoing Teſtimonies in this Chapter, to be falſe, and it is confeſſed by ſome of the *Roman Authors* themſelves.

In a word, the *Fathers* make a ſign to be inferiour, and to fall ſhort of the thing ſignified; thus

(t) *Hom. 8. in Epiſt. ad Roman.* Σφόδρα αὐτῆς καταδεεστέρα, καὶ τοσούτῳ, ὅσῳ σημεῖον τοῦ πράγματος ὑπέρ ἐστι σημεῖον.

S. *Chryſoſtom* (t) ſays, *It is inferiour to it, and ſo much the more, as a ſign is below the thing of which it is a ſign.*

So alſo S. *Jerome* (as we heard before) puts *the Body and Blood of Chriſt* in the Euchariſt, in the ſame rank as to veneration with holy *Chalices*, *Veils*, and other things that relate to the Paſſion of our Lord

2 Remark. *The Fathers aſſert, that an Image and Type muſt viſibly demonſtrate that of which it is an Image.*

(u) *Hom. 1. in Geneſ.* Qui viderit imaginem alicujus, videt eum cujus imago eſt.

Origen (u). *He that ſees the Image of a perſon, ſees him of whom it is an Image.*

(x) *Lib. 1. cont. Marcel. c. 4.* Αἱ εἰκόνες τῶν ὧν εἰσὶν εἰκόνες καὶ ἀπόντων δεικτικαί εἰσιν, ὥστε καὶ τὸ ἀπὸν δι' αὐτῶν φαίνεσθαι δοκεῖν.

Marcellus Ancbyr. apud Euſebium (x). *Images are demonſtrative of thoſe of whom they are Images, ſo that by them he that is abſent ſeems to appear.*

(y) *In Cant. Hom. 15.* Τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ἐναργῶς ἐν τῷ ὁμοιώματι καθορᾶται.

Greg. Nyſſen (y). *The Original is plainly ſeen in the likeneſs of it.*

(z) *De Synodis.* Eum cujus Imago eſt, neceſſe eſt ut imago demonſtret.

Hilary (z). *It is neceſſary that an Image ſhould demonſtrate him of whom it is an Image.*

Which

Which plainly confutes thoſe mens fancies in the Church of *Rome* (*a*), who make Chriſt *inviſibly preſent* in the Euchariſt, to be the ſign of himſelf *viſibly ſuffering* upon the Croſs.

(*a*) *Bellarm. de Euchar. l.* 2. *cap.* 15.

For as *Greg. Nyſſen* (*b*) ſays. *How can a man form an Idea of a viſible thing from an Inviſible?*

And *Tertullian* laughs at it as ridiculous, when he ſays, (*c*) *No one that intends to ſhow a man, brings in a Helmet, or a Vizard.* Which, we know, hide him from our ſight.

Irenæus (*d*) ſays, *A Type is often different from the Truth, according to the matter and ſubſtance of the Type, but according to the habit and lineaments, it ought to keep likeneſs, and likewiſe by things preſent, ſhow thoſe things that are not preſent.*

(*b*) *Lib.* 1. *cont. Eunom.* Πῶς ἐκ τῦ ὁρατῦ τὸ ἀοράτον πυκτεύσῃ καταγόνατος;

(*c*) *Lib. de carne Chriſti c.* 11. Nemo oſtendere volens hominem, caſſidem aut perſonam introducit.

(*d*) *L.* 2. *adv. hæreſ. c.* 40. Typus ſecundùm materiam & ſubſtantiam aliquoties à veritate diverſus eſt. Secundùm autem habitum & lineamentum debet ſervare ſimilitudinem, & ſimiliter oſtendere per præſentia, ea quæ non ſunt præſentia.

3. Remark. *The Fathers plainly make the Bread and Wine in the Euchariſt, to be Signs and Symbols of Chriſt as abſent.*

S. *Ambroſe* (*e*). *Here is the ſhadow, here the Image, there* (viz. *in Heaven*) *is the Truth. The ſhadow is in the Law, the Image in the Goſpel, the Truth in Heaven.*

(*e*) *L.* 1. *de Offic. cap.* 48. Hic umbra, hic Imago, illic veritas. Umbra in Lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in Cœleſtibus.

Again (*f*). *Aſcend, O Man, into Heaven, and thou ſhalt ſee thoſe things, of which there was here only a ſhadow or Image.*

(*f*) *In Pſalm* 38. Aſcende ergo, homo, in cœlum, & videbis illa quorum umbra hic erat vel Imago.

Maximus (*g*) the Interpreter of the *Spurious Dionyſius*, ſpeaking of the Bread and Wine which he calls *Holy Gifts*, ſays, *They are Symbols of things above that are more true.*

(*g*) *In cap.* 1. *Hierarch. Eccleſ.* Ἅγια δῶρα. Σύμβολα τῶν ἄνω καὶ ἀληθινωτέρων.

So again (*h*) elſewhere he ſays, *The things of the Old Law were a ſhadow, thoſe of the New Teſtament were an Image, but the ſtate of the World to come is the Truth.*

(*h*) *In cap.* 3. Σκία μὲν τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς, εἰκὼν δὲ τὰ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, ἀλήθεια δὲ ἡ τῶν μελλόντων καθέστασις.

Theodoret (*i*). *After his coming there will be no more need of Symbols* (*or Signs*) *when the Body it ſelf appears.*

(*i*) *In* 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐκείνου παρουσίαν, οὐκ ἔτι χρεία τῶν συμβόλων τῷ σώματι, αὐτῷ φαινομένῳ τῷ σώματι.

I refer the Reader to the Teſtimonies produced before (*Chap.* 10. *Poſition* 2.) out of S. *Auſtin, Sedulius, Primaſius, Bede*, &c.

I will conclude this Chapter with a paſſage or two out of the Prayers after the Sacrament in the Old Liturgy, uſed in *Bertram*'s time (*k*).

We who have now received the Pledge of Eternal Life, moſt humbly beſeech thee to grant, (*l*) *That we may be manifeſtly made partakers of that which we here receive in the Image of the Sacrament.*

And thus afterwards (*m*) in another Prayer. *Let thy Sacraments work in us, O Lord, we beſeech thee, thoſe things which they contain, that we may really be partakers of thoſe things which now we celebrate in a Figure.*

(*k*) *V. Bertram de corp. & ſang. Chriſti prope finem.* p. 112. *Edit. ult. Lat. Engl.*

(*l*) Ut quod in imagine contingimus Sacramenti, manifeſta participatione ſumamus.

(*m*) *Ibid.* p. 114. Perficiant in nobis quæſumus, Domine, tua Sacramenta quod continent; ut quæ nunc ſpecie gerimus, rerum veritate capiamus.

Bertram Comments upon theſe Prayers, in ſuch paſſages as theſe. "*Whence it appears*, ſays he, *that this Body and Blood* "*of Chriſt are the Pledge and Image of ſomething to come, which* "*is now only repreſented, but ſhall hereafter be plainly exhibited.* "—— *therefore it is one thing which is now celebrated, and ano-* "*ther which ſhall hereafter be manifeſted.* And afterwards "(p. 115.) *The Prayer ſays, that theſe things are celebrated in* "*a Figure, not in Truth, that is, by way of ſimilitude (or repre-* "*ſentation) not the manifeſtation of the thing it ſelf. Now the* "*Figure and the Truth are very different things: Therefore the* "*Body and Blood of Chriſt, which is celebrated in the Church, diſ-* "*fers from the Body and Blood of Chriſt which is glorified ſince the* "*Reſurrection*, &c.

P. 117. "*We ſee how vaſt a difference there is between the myſtery of* "*Chriſts Body and Blood which the faithful now receive in the* "*Church, and that Body which was born of the Virgin* Mary, "*which ſuffered, roſe again, aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth at* "*the right hand of the Father. For this Body which we celebrate* "*in our way (to happineſs) muſt be ſpiritually received; for Faith* "*believes ſomewhat that it ſees not; and it ſpiritually feeds the* "*Soul, makes glad the heart, and confers Eternal Life and In-* "*corruption, if we attend not to that which feeds the Body, which* "*is chew'd with our teeth, and ground in pieces, but to that which* "*is ſpiritually received by Faith. But now that Body in which* "*Chriſt ſuffered and roſe again, was his own proper Body which* "*he aſſumed of the Virgin, which might be ſeen and felt after his* "*Reſurrection*, &c.

It

It is very obſervable, and a great confirmation of what has been ſaid in this Chapter, That the Ancient Chriſtians of S. *Thomas*, inhabiting the Mountains of *Malabar* in the *Eaſt Indies*, agree with the *Ancient Church* in denying our Saviours *Corporal Preſence* in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; as appears from their *Publick Offices*, and other Books, mentioned in a *Synod* which was celebrated amongſt them by *Dom Aleixo de Menezes* Archbiſhop of *Goa*, in the Year 1599.

In the fourteenth Decree of the third Action of the ſaid Synod, in which moſt of their *Church Offices* and other Books are Condemned, for containing Doctrines contrary to the Roman Faith, there is particular notice taken of their contradicting the Roman Faith in the point of Tranſubſtantiation.

1. The Book of *Timothy* the *Patriarch* is condemned, for aſſerting through three Chapters, that the true Body of Chriſt our Lord is not in the Sacrament of the Altar, but only the Figure of his Body.

2. The *Book of Homilies* is condemned, which teacheth, that the *H. Euchariſt* is only the *Image of Chriſt*, as the Image of a Man is diſtinguiſhed from a real Man; and that the Body of Chriſt is not there, but in Heaven.

3. The Book of the *Expoſition of the Goſpels* is condemn'd, which teacheth, that the *Euchariſt* is only the Image of the Body of Chriſt, and that his Body is in Heaven at the right Hand of the Father, and not upon Earth.

4. Their *Breviary*, which they call *Iludre* and *Gaza*, is condemn'd; which teaches, that the moſt H. Sacrament of the Euchariſt is not the true Body of Chriſt.

Laſtly, The *Office* of the *Burial of Prieſts* is condemn'd, where it is ſaid, that the moſt H. Sacrament of the Altar, is no more but the virtue of Chriſt, and not his true Body and Blood.

This Synod was Printed in the Univerſity of *Conimbra*, with the Licences of the Inquiſition and Ordinary in the Year 1606. and is in the Poſſeſſion of a Learned Perſon, who gave me this account out of it.

CHAP. XII.

The Twelfth Difference.

The Fathers *assert, That Christ's Body is not eaten corporally and carnally, but only spiritually. But the Church of* Rome *teaches a Corporal Eating, a Descent of Christ's Natural Body into ours, and understands the Eating of Christ's Body literally and carnally.*

IF the Church of *Rome* declares its own Faith, when it imposes the Profession of it upon another, and makes one abjure the contrary under pain of *Anathema*; then I am sure it was once with a witness for the eating of Christ's Body in the most *literal and proper Sense*; when *An. Dom.* 1059. Pope *Nicholas* II. and the General Council of *Lateran*, prescribed a Profession of it to *Berengarius*, made him swear it, and anathematize the contrary, as it is set down by *Lanfrank* (*n*); which because the *Nubes Testium* (tho' it has set down two other Forms) durst not give us, I will therefore here transcribe out of him.

(*n*) *De Eucharist. Sacram. adv. Berengar.*

Ego Berengarius indignus Diaconus Ecclesiæ S. Mauritii Andegavensis, cognoscens veram Catholicam & Apostolicam Fidem, anathematizo omnem Hæresin, præcipue eam de quâ hactenus infamatus sum; quæ astruere conatur panem & vinum quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem solummodo Sacramentum, & non verum corpus & sanguinem Dom. nostri Jesu Christi esse; nec posse sensualiter, nisi in solo Sacramento, manibus Sacerdotum tractari, vel frangi, aut fidelium dentibus atteri. Consentio autem S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ & Apostolicæ sedi, & ore & corde profiteor de Sacramentis Dominicæ mensæ,

I Berengarius, *unworthy Deacon*, &c. *knowing the true Catholick and Apostolick Faith, do anathematize all Heresie, especially that for which I have hitherto been defamed; which endeavours to maintain, that the Bread and Wine placed on the Altar, after Consecration, are only a Sacrament* (or Sign), *and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and cannot, save only in the Sign, be handled or broken by the Priest's Hands, or be ground by the Teeth of the Faithful. But I agree with the Holy Roman Church, and the Apostolick Seat, and do with my Mouth, and from my Heart profess, That I hold the same Faith concerning the Sacraments of the Lords Table, which our Lord and Venerable Pope* Nicholas *and this Holy Synod, by Evangelical and Apostolical Authority, has delivered to me to hold, and confirmed to me,*

viz.

viz. *That the Bread and Wine which are placed on the Altar, after Conſecration, are not only a Sacrament, but alſo the true Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and is ſenſibly, not only in the Sign and Sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the Prieſts Hands, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful: Swearing this by the Holy and Co-eſſential Trinity, and by the moſt Holy Goſpels of Chriſt. And as for thoſe that oppoſe this Faith, I judge them, with their Opinions and Followers, worthy of an eternal Anathema*, &c.

eam fidem tenere, quam Dominus & Venerabilis Papa Nicholaus & hæc S. Synodus authoritate Evangelica & Apoſtolica tenendam tradidit, mihique firmavit: ſcilicet, Panem & vinum quæ in altari ponuntur poſt conſecrationem, non ſolum Sacramentum, ſed etiam verum corpus D. N. J. Chriſti eſſe, & ſenſualiter non ſolum Sacramento, ſed in veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari, frangi & fidelium dentibus atteri, jurans per S. & homouſion Trinitatem, & per hæc ſacroſancta Chriſti Evangelia. Eos vero qui contra hanc fidem venerint cum dogmatibus & ſectatoribus ſuis æterno anathemate dignos eſſe pronuncio, &c.

This we may look upon as the Belief of that Church then, and this to be the manner of eating the Body of Chriſt: ſince, as *Bellarmine* well obſerves (*o*), *None are compelled to abjure and anathematize dubious Opinions, but only ſuch as are condemned by the Church as known Hereſies.*

(*o*) *De Sacr. Euchar. l.* 3. *c.* 21. Nec coguntur ulli abjurare & anathematizare ſententias dubias, ſed eas tantùm quæ damnantur ab Eccleſia, tanquam hæreſes exploratæ.

But however Infallible this *Pope* and that *General Council* were, this way of eating Chriſt's Body, by *tearing it with the Teeth*, was quickly oppoſed, (as a late Learned Preface to the Determination of *Joh. Pariſienſis* ſhews at large.)

Peter Lombard could not digeſt it (*p*). For tho' the *Pope* and *Council* defined, That both the *handling*, and alſo the *breaking and tearing with the Teeth* of Chriſt's Body, were not only in the Sign and Sacrament, but in Truth performed; he makes a diſtinction, and in expreſs words (cited in the Margin) ſays, That Chriſt's Body is handled indeed, not only *in Sacrament*, but *in Truth*; but that it is *broken* and *torn with the Teeth truly* indeed, but yet only *in Sacrament*. That is, in the *viſible Species*, as he before explains that Phraſe. Directly contrary to *Berengarius*'s Recantation.

(*p*) *Sentent. lib.* 4. *diſt.* 12. Fractio & partes quæ ibi videntur fieri, in Sacramento fiunt, i. e. in viſibili ſpecie. Ideoque illa Berengarii verba ita diſtinguenda ſunt, ut ſenſualiter, non modo in Sacramento, ſed in veritate dicatur corpus Chriſti *tractari manibus Sacerdotum: Frangi* verò & *atteri dentibus*, verè quidem, ſed in Sacramento tantùm.

The:

The words also of *Joh. Semeca*, the Author of the Gloss upon the Canon-Law (q), are very bold against it. *Unless you understand the words of* Berengarius *in a sound sense*, (and there can be no other, the words are so plain, but what must contradict it) *you will fall into a greater Heresie than he was guilty of; and therefore you must refer all to the Species*, (that's directly contrary to the Pope and Council) *for we do not make Parts of Christ's Body.*

(q) *Gloss. apud Gratian. de Consecr. Dist. 2. c Ego Berengarius.* Nisi sanè intelligas verba Berengarii in majorem incides Hæresin quam ipse habuit; & ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas; nam de Christi corpore partes non facimus.

In fine, all the great Writers, especially the *Jesuits*, have forsaken this Definition, as not to be maintained, and this Eating in the most proper sense is wholly discarded; and we are told (r) by *Bellarmine*, That *grinding with the Teeth is not necessarily required to Eating; but it suffices that it be taken in, and transmitted from the Mouth into the Stomach by humane and natural Instruments*, viz. *the Tongue and Palate.*

(r) *De Sacr. Euchar. l. 1. c. 11.* Ad rationem manducationis, non est necessaria attritio, sed satis est sumptio, & transmissio ab ore ad stomachum per instrumenta humana & naturalia, i. e. linguam & palatum.

This way, in plainer terms, is *swallowing the Body of Christ without chewing.* And indeed without *this Descent of it into the Body*, there could no Account be given of that Prayer in the *Roman Missal* (s): *Lord, let thy Body which I have taken, and thy Blood which I have drunk, cleave unto my Entrals.*

(s) Corpus tuum, Domine, quod sumpsi, & sanguis quem potavi, adhæreat visceribus meis.

They have also determined how long this Sacred Body makes its stay there. *Aquinas* (whom they all now follow) says (t), *The Body of Christ remains in this Sacrament, so long as the Sacramental Species remain: When they cease to be, the Body of Christ ceases to be under them.*

(t) *In 3. part. quæst. 76. art. 6. ad 3.* Corpus Christi remanet in hoc Sacramento, quousque species sacramentales manent. Quibus cessantibus desinit esse corpus Christi sub eis.

Thus also *Domin. Soto* (u). *We ought undoubtedly to hold, That Christ's Body descends into the Stomach. ——Since Digestion is made in the Stomach, there the Species cease to be, and so also Christ's Body, and therefore will not descend into the Draught.*

(u) *In 4. dist. 12. qu. 1. art. 3.* Est indubiè tenendum quod corpus (sc. Christi) descendit in stomachum. ——Cùm digestio fiat in stomacho illic desinunt esse species, atque adeo corpus, quare non descendit in ventrem.

But

But now comes a ſcurvy Caſe, that will force out the whole Truth. Suppoſe, by reaſon of any Diſeaſe, the *Species* ſhould deſcend further than the Stomach; as in a Flux, when there is no Digeſtion of the *Species*, nor time to do it in the Stomach, but they are preſently carried downward whole, or elſe brought up immediately, as in caſe of ſudden Vomiting. This alſo is reſolved by the ſame Principles. So the laſt-named *Author* (x). *If by reaſon of any Diſeaſe the Species ſhould deſcend,* (into the Draught, he means) *the Body alſo it ſelf would deſcend and be ſent forth. For Shame ought not to be a Reaſon for denying the Truth.*

(x) *Soto ibid.* Sed ſi ob aliquem morbum ſpecies deſcenderent, conſequenter & ipſum corpus deſcenderet & emitteretur. Pudor enim non debet eſſe in cauſa negandi veritatem.

To which S. *Antoninus* (y) agrees, (citing *Paludanus* in the caſe.) *Therefore the Body and Blood of Chriſt remains ſo long in the Belly and Stomach, or Vomit, or any where elſe, as the Species remain, juſt as the converted Subſtance* (viz. Bread and Wine) *would have remained. And if the Species are vomited up whole, or go forth* (downwards) *there is truly the Body of Chriſt.*

(y) *Part.* 3. *tit.* 13. *cap.* 6. *ſect.* 3. Igitur corpus Chriſti & ſanguis tamdiu manet in ventre & ſtomacho vel vomitu & quocunque alibi, quamdiu ſpecies manent, ſicut ſubſtantia converſa manſiſſet. Et ſi ſpecies incorruptæ evomuntur, vel egrediuntur, eſt ibi vere corpus Chriſti.

And he tells us of S. *Hugo Cluniac.* how he commended one *Goderamus*, who (by a ſtrange fervor) ſwallowed down the Particles of an Hoſt, which a Leper had vomited up with vile Spittle, ſaying, That S. *Laurence* his Gridiron was more tolerable.

If theſe Conſequences ſeem horrid and deteſtable to the Reader, the Doctrine, from which they neceſſarily flow, ought to be look'd upon much more ſo.

But now, to return to the Fathers, and their Senſe of *Eating the Body of Chriſt.*

It is evident to any that will impartially conſult their Writings, that they were perfect Strangers to all theſe Caſes that are thus currently reſolved in the *Roman Church.*

That Chriſt's Natural Body ſhould enter into ours, is too groſs and carnal a Thought, to be attributed to them; and fits only the Imaginations of a *Carnal Church*, and of thoſe *Capernaites*, who in the Sixth of S. *John* ask, *How can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat?*

Chriſt tells them, That the Words he ſpoke to them were *Spirit* and *Life*. And ſo the *Fathers* always underſtood the

Eating

eating of Christ's Body and drinking his Blood, not in a *literal* and *proper*, but in a *figurative* and *ſpiritual Senſe*; as I ſhall now prove from their Writings. Wherein it may not be amiſs to take notice, firſt, What their Senſe is about underſtanding things *carnally* and *ſpiritually*.

S. *Chryſoſtome* (z) asking this Queſtion, *What is it to think* (or underſtand) *carnally?* He anſwers, *Simply to look upon the things propoſed, and to think of no more.*——*But we ought to view all Myſteries with our inward Eyes: for this is ſpiritually to view them.*

S. *Auſtin* (a) gives the ſame account. *We have a carnal Taſte, when we take that which is figuratively ſpoken, as if it were properly ſpoken.*

And elſewhere (b). *Every figurative and allegorical Reading or Speech, ſeems to ſound one thing carnally, and to inſinuate another thing ſpiritually.*

S. *Auſtin* (c) further gives a Rule when to underſtand a thing literally, and when to underſtand it figuratively and ſpiritually. *If the Speech be by way of command, either forbidding a Crime or beinous Wickedneſs, or bidding a beneficial or good thing to be done, it is not figurative: But if it ſeems to command a Crime or beinous Wickedneſs, or forbid an uſeful and beneficial thing, it is figurative.* And then he gives the Example of his Rule, in thoſe words of Chriſt, *Except ye eat the Fleſh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye have no Life in you. Now this,* ſays he, *ſeems to command a Crime or horrid thing; therefore it is a Figure, commanding us to communicate in the Paſſion of our Lord, and ſweetly and profitably to treaſure up in our Memory, that his Fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.*

Origen ſaid the very ſame before him (d), and gives the ſame Inſtance. *Not only in the Old Teſtament is found the killing Letter: there is alſo in the New Teſtament a Letter that kills him who do's not ſpiritually conſider what is ſaid. For if*

(z) *Hom.* 46. *in Joan.* Τί δ' ἐστι τὸ σαρκικῶς νοῆσαι;——Τὰ ἁπλῶς εἰς τὸ προκείμενα ἰδεῖν, καὶ μὴ πλέον φαντάζεσθαι.——Χρὴ γὰρ πάντα μυστήρια τοῖς ἔνδον ὀφθαλμοῖς καθορᾶσθαι· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι πνευματικῶς.

(a) *De Doctr. Chriſt.* l. 3. c. 5. Cùm figuratè dictum ſic accipitur, tanquam propriè dictum ſit, carnaliter ſapitur.

(b) *Serm.* 44. *de diverſis.* Omnis figurata & allegorica lectio vel locutio, aliud videtur ſonare carnaliter, aliud inſinuare ſpiritualiter.

(c) *De Doctr. Chriſt* l. 3. c. 16. Si præceptiva eſt locutio, aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut beneficentiam jubens, non eſt figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata eſt. *Niſi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, &c.* facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: Figura ergo eſt, præcipiens paſſioni Domini eſſe communicandum, & ſuaviter atque utiliter in memoria condendum, quod caro ejus pro nobis crucifixa & vulnerata eſt.

(d) *Hom.* 7. *in Levitic.* Non ſolùm in Veteri Teſtamento occidens Litera deprehenditur, eſt & in N. Teſtamento Litera quæ occidit eum qui non ſpi-

if thou follow this according to the Letter which was said, Unless ye eat my Flesh and drink my Blood, *this Letter kills.*

ritualiter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundùm literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, *Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, & biberitis sanguinem meum,* occidit hæc litera.

And in another place (*e*). *We are not to eat the Flesh of the Lamb, as the Slaves of the Letter do, &c.* To which he opposes those *who receive the Spirituals of the Word.*

Such as those whom S. *Austin* mentions (*f*), who pleased God and died not (*i. e.* eternally). *Because they understood the visible Food* (Manna) *spiritually, they hungred spiritually, they tasted spiritually, that they might spiritually be satisfied.*

Or, as he expresses it a little after (*g*), *He that eats inwardly, not outwardly; that eats in his Heart, not he that presseth it with his Teeth.* And therefore elsewhere * exhorts them, *Do not prepare your Jaws, but your Heart.*

This is what *Clemens Alexandr.* (*h*) requires, when he says, *That Christ, when he broke the Bread, set it before them, that we may eat it rationally, i. e.* spiritually.

So S. *Austin* again (*i*). *The Body and Blood of Christ will then be Life to every one, if what is visibly taken in the Sacrament, be in truth spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk.* Where he makes this to be *eating in Truth,* and the other but *Sacramental.*

So *Macarius* (*k*) having called the Bread and Wine the *Antitype* of Christ's Flesh and Blood, he adds, *They which are Partakers of the visible Bread, do spiritually eat the Flesh of the Lord.* He should rather have said *orally,* according to the Doctrine of our Adversaries.

S. *Athanasius* (*l*) expounding those words, *What if ye see the Son of Man ascending where he was before? It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing,* &c. adds, *He affirmed both of himself, the Flesh and Spirit, and made a difference*

(*e*) *In Joan. Tom.* 10. Οὐχ ἡμῖν οὖν βρωτέον τὴν σάρκα τοῦ ἀμνοῦ ὥσπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ τῆς λέξεως δοῦλοι, &c.

—Τὰ πνευματικὰ λόγου μεταλαμβάνοντες.

(*f*) *In Joan. tract.* 26. Quia visibilem cibum spiritaliter intellexerunt, spiritaliter esurierunt, spiritaliter gustaverunt, ut spiritaliter satiarentur.

(*g*) *Ibid.* Qui manducat intus non foris, qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente.

* *Serm.* 33. *de Verb. Dom.* Nolite parare fauces, sed cor.

(*h*) *Strom l.* 1. Κλάσας τὸν ἄρτον προέθηκεν ἵνα δὴ φάγωμεν λογικῶς.

(*i*) *De Verb. Apost. Serm.* 2. Tunc vita unicuique erit corpus & sanguis Christi, si quod in sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, spiritualiter bibatur.

(*k*) *Homil.* 27.

——Καὶ οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ κυρίου ἐσθίουσι.

(*l*) *Tract. in illud Evang.* Quicunque dixerit verbum contra filium hominis.

—Ἵνα μὴ μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀόρατον αὐτοῦ πιστεύοντες.

rence betwixt the Spirit and the Flesh, that not only believing that of him which was visible, but what was invisible, they might learn, that those things which he spake were not carnal, but spiritual. For to how many could his Body have sufficed for Meat, that it should be made the Food of the whole World? But therefore he mentions the Son of Man's Ascension into Heaven, that he might draw them from this corporal Conceit, and hereafter might learn, that the Flesh he spake of was celestial Meat from above, and spiritual Nourishment to be given by him, &c.

——Πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρῶσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου πάντος τοῦτο τροφὴ γίνηται;

——Ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοὺς ἀφελκύσῃ.

It will suffice all the World, if we follow *Tertullian's* (*m*) Advice. *Since the Word was made Flesh, he is to be long'd for that we may live, to be devoured by Hearing, to be chewed by Understanding, and digested by Faith.*

(*m*) *De Resurr. c.* 37. Quia & sermo caro erat factus, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus, & devorandus auditu, & ruminandus intellectu, & fide digerendus.

It is an excellent Comment on this, which *Eusebius* gives us (*n*) upon those words of *John* 6. *The Flesh profits nothing,* &c. *Do not imagine that I speak of that Flesh I am encompassed withal, as if you must eat that; nor think that I command you to drink sensible and corporeal Blood: But know, that the very Words that I have spoken to you are Spirit and Life. So that these very Words and Speeches of his, are his Flesh and Blood; whereof whoso is always Partaker, being nourished as it were with heavenly Bread, shall be a Partaker of heavenly Life.——Let not the hasty hearing of those things by me, of Flesh and Blood, trouble you; for things sensibly heard profit nothing, but it is the Spirit that quickneth them that can spiritually hear them.*

(*n*) *Lib.* 3. *Eccl. Theol. c.* 17. Μὴ γὰρ τὴν σάρκα, ἣν περίκειμαι, νομίσητέ με λεγεῖν, ὡς δέον αὐτὴν ἐσθίειν, μηδὲ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ σωματικὸν αἷμα πίνειν, ὑπολαμβάνετέ με προστάττειν. ——Ὥστε αὐτὰ ἐστὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα.

——Ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ αἰσθητῶς ἀκούμενα, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν τοὺς πνευματικῶς ἀκούειν δυναμένους.

S. *Basil* (*o*) says the same. *There is an intellectual Mouth of the inward Man, whereby he is nourished who receives the Word of Life, which is the Bread that descended from Heaven.*

(*o*) *In Psal.* 33. Ἔστι μὲν τι καὶ νοητὸν στόμα τοῦ ἔνδον ἀνθρώπου, ᾧ τρέφεται μεταλαμβάνων τοῦ λογοῦ τῆς ζωῆς, ὃς ἐστιν ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς.

Facundus Hermian. (*p*) takes this of eating Christ's Flesh to be a Mystery, and that S. *Peter* when he answered, *Lord, whither should we go? thou hast the Words of Eternal Life,* did not then

(*p*) *Lib.* 12. *Defens.* 3. *capit. c.* 1.

then understand it. *For*, says he, *if he had understood the Mystery, he should rather have said, Lord, there is no reason we should go away, since we believe we shall be saved by Faith in thy Body and Blood.* He means his Death and Passion, which is his Sense of eating Christ's Body and Blood.

Quod si mysterium intellexisset, hoc potius diceret, Domine, cur abeamus non est, cùm credamus nos corporis & sanguinis tui fide salvandos.

Theodorus Heracleot. (q) refers this eating Christ's Flesh to the *sincere embracing the Oeconomy of his Incarnation. These*, says he, *upon the reasoning of their Minds, by assenting to it, as it were tasting the Doctrine, do rationally* (or spiritually) *eat his Flesh, and by Faith partake of his Blood.*

(q) *Catena in Joan.* 6.54,55.

——Τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς λογισμῷ διὰ τῆς συγκαταθέσεως ὥσπερ ἀπογευσάμενοι τοῦ δόγματος, λογικῶς ἐσθίουσι τὴν σάρκα καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσι τοῦ αἵματος.

S. *Chrysostom* (r) upon those words, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, reckons up some of those carnal Doubts that profit nothing; as, *It is a carnal thing*, says he, *to doubt how Christ descended from Heaven, and to imagine him to be the Son of* Joseph, *and how he can give us his Flesh to eat. All these are carnal, which ought to be mystically and spiritually understood.*

(r) *Hom.* 46. *in Joan.* Σαρκικὸν δὲ ἦν τὸ ἀμφισβητεῖν πῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκε, καὶ τὸ νομίζειν ὅτι υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ τὸ πῶς δύναται ἡμῖν τὴν σάρκα δοῦναι φαγεῖν· ταῦτα πάντα σαρκικά, ἅπερ ἔδει μυστικῶς νοεῖν καὶ πνευματικῶς, &c.

Cyril of *Jerusalem* (s) says, That the Jews, for want of understanding spiritually Christ's words, *imagined that Christ exhorted them to devour his Flesh*; which is hard to be distinguish'd from the Roman Churches *Oral Manducation.*

(s) *Catech. Mystag.* 4.

Νομίζοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ σαρκοφαγίαν αὐτοὺς προτρέπεται.

This carnal Fancy might well make them shrink, and cry out, *This is a hard Saying, who can hear it?* For, as S. *Austin* (t) well observes, *It seems more horrible to eat Humane Flesh, than to kill it; and to drink Mans Blood, than to shed it.*

(t) *Cont. advers. Legis l.* 2. *c.* 9. Horribilius videatur humanam carnem manducare quam perimere, & humanum sanguinem potare quam fundere.

Origen's (u) words (for I see no good reason to question they are his) are enough to convince effectually all such *carnal Jews* and *Christians. There is a Meat and Drink for this material and outward Man, as we call him, agreeable to his Nature*, viz. *this corporeal and earthly Food. There is likewise a proper Food for the spiritual,*

(u) *Prolog. in Cantic.* Est materialis hujus hominis, qui & exterior appellatur, cibus potusque naturæ suæ cognatus, corporeus iste, sc. & terrenus. Similiter autem & spiritualis

hominis ipſius, qui & interior dicitur, eſt proprius cibus, *ut panis ille vivus qui de cœlo deſcendit, &c.* —— Rerum vero proprietas unicuique diſcreta ſervatur, & corruptibili corruptibilia præbentur, incorruptibili verò incorruptibilia proponuntur.

(x) *Hom.* 1. *in Cantic.* Ἀναλογία τίς ἐστι τῶν ψυχικῶν κινημάτων καὶ ἐνεργημάτων πρὸς τὰ τοῦ σώματος αἰσθητήρια, &c. —— Ὁ γὰρ ἔστι τι καὶ γάλα τῇ γεύσει κρῖναι· νοητὸν δὲ ὄντων ἐκείνων, νοητὴν πως καὶ ἡ ἀντιληπτικὴ τούτων ἡ ψυχὴ δεῖ δυνάμεως.

(y) *Homil.* 26. *in Matth.* —— Ἑαυτὸν δοῦναι ἡμῖν εἰς ἑορτὴν καὶ εὐωχίαν πνευματικήν.

(z) *Comment. in Exod.* Cœleſtis ſeu divinus Agnus animarum ſolet eſſe cibus.

(a) *Tract.* 1. *in Epiſt. Joan.* —— Ipſum jam in cœlo ſedentem manu contrectare non poſſumus, ſed fide contingere.

(b) *Tract.* 26. *in Evang. Joan.* Non ad Chriſtum ambulando currimus, ſed credendo: nec motu corporis, ſed voluntate cordis accedimus.

—— Sic ſe tangi voluit, ſic tangitur ab eis à quibus benè tangitur, aſcendens ad patrem, manens cum patre, æqualis patri.

(c) *Idem Tract.* 27. *in Joan.* Quid eſt hoc? Hinc ſolvit illud quod non noverant —— Illi enim putabant eum erogaturum corpus ſuum, ille autem dixit, ſe aſcenſurum in cœlum, utique integrum. Cùm videritis filium hominis aſcendentem ubi erat priùs, certè vel tunc videbitis quia non eo modo quo putatis erogat corpus ſuum, cer-

ſpiritual, or, as we call it, inward Man, as that living Bread that came down from Heaven, *&c.* ——*But the Property of things is reſerved to each diſtinct, and corruptible things are given to that which is corruptible, and incorruptible things are propoſed to that which is incorruptible.*

Greg. Nyſſen (x) alſo well expreſſes it thus. *There is an Analogy betwixt the Motions and Operations of the Soul and the Senſes of the Body,* &c.

——*Wine and Milk are judged of by the Taſte; but theſe being intellectual, the Power of the Soul that apprehends them muſt be altogether intellectual.*

S. *Chryſoſtom* (y) ſaid well, *That Chriſt gave himſelf to us for a ſpiritual Feaſt and Banquet.*

And *Procopius Gazæus* (z). *The Celeſtial and Divine Lamb is wont to be the Food of Souls.*

S. *Auſtin* (a) indeed tells us, *We cannot handle him who now ſits in Heaven; yet,* ſays he, *we may touch him by our Faith.*

For, as he ſays elſewhere (b), *We run to Chriſt, not by walking, but by believing; nor do we approach him by the Motion of our Bodies, but by the Will of our Hearts.*

And afterwards.——*Thus he would be touched, and thus he is touched by all that rightly touch him, aſcending to the Father, remaining with the Father, equal to the Father.*

And in the next Tractate (c) upon thoſe words, *What if ye ſee the Son of Man aſcend,* &c. *What do's this mean? He hence reſolves that which they did not know* ——*For they imagined, that he would beſtow his Body upon them; and he told them, that he would aſcend into Heaven entire and whole. When you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcending where he was before, then ſurely you will ſee, that he do's not beſtow his Body after*

that.

that manner you think he do's: Surely you will then at leaſt underſtand, that his Grace is not conſumed by bites (of the Teeth.)

Gelaſius (*d*) therefore ſaid well: *To believe on the Son of God, this is to ſee him, this is to hear him, this is to ſmell, this is to taſte him, and this is to handle him.*

tè vel tunc intelligeris, quia gratia ejus non conſumitur morſibus.

(*d*) *Contr. Eutych. l.* 4. Credere in filium Dei, hoc eſt videre, hoc eſt audire, hoc eſt odorari, hoc eſt guſtare, hoc eſt contrectare eum.

Theſe Teſtimonies, one would think, are ſufficient to tell us the Senſe of the Fathers in this Matter; yet, with the Reader's leave, I will add a few Conſiderations more, to put it out of all doubt.

1 Conſideration. *It appears there is no neceſſity to underſtand eating and drinking Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt, of his natural Body received into ours; becauſe the Fathers ſay, We eat and drink, and partake of Chriſt's Body and Blood in Baptiſm, which, by the confeſſion of all, can be done only ſpiritually there.*

Thus *Cyril of Alexandria* (*e*) ſays, *The Gentiles could not have ſhaken off their Blindneſs, and contemplated the Divine and H. Light, that is, attained the Knowledge of the Holy and Conſubſtantial Trinity, unleſs by Holy Baptiſm they had been made Partakers of his Holy Fleſh, and waſhed away the blackneſs of their Sin, and ſhak'd off the Devil's Power.*

(*e*) *In Joan. 9. 6.*

—Εἰ μὴ γίγνοτο μέτοχα τ ἁγίας αὐτῦ σαρκὸς, ὅτε. διὰ τ ἁγίου λελεύσου βαπτίσματ[ος].

And elſewhere (*f*) ſpeaking of the Eunuch: *He by his Queſtion,* ſays he, *ſhewed, that he was Partaker of the Spiritual Lamb; for he was preſently thought worthy of Baptiſm.*

(*f*) *Glaphyr. in Exod. libr.* 2. Μήποτε ἤδη τ νοητῦ μεμελέτηκε δια τ ἐρωτήσεως ἀνεξικάκως, ἄξιος γὰρ εὐθὺς κ βεβαπτίσθη.

Fulgentius (*g*). Unleſs ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye ſhall have no Life in you. *Which whoſoever can conſider, not only according to the Myſtery of Truth* (viz. in the Sacraments) *but according to the Truth of the Myſtery, will ſee that this is done in the Laver of Holy Regeneration.*

(*g*) *De Bapt. Æthiop. in fine.* Niſi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis ejus ſanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Quod quiſquis non ſolum ſecundùm veritatis myſteria, ſed ſecundùm myſterii veritatem conſiderare poterit, in ipſo Lavacro S. Regenerationis hoc fieri providebit.

And again (*h*). *Neither need any one in the leaſt doubt, that every Believer is then made Partaker*

(*h*) *Ibid.* Nec cuiquam eſſe aliquatenus ambigendum, tunc

unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque participem fieri, quando in baptismate membrum corporis Christi efficitur.

taker of Christ's Body and Blood, when he is made in Baptism a Member of Christ's Body.

Therefore S. *Basil* (i) says, That *the Lord takes away Christ from those who having put him on by Baptism, by sinning afterwards trample upon his Body, and count the Blood of the Covenant an unholy thing.*

(i) *In Esa.* 3.

—Τὸ σῶμα καταπατοῦντων, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησαμένων.

2 Consideration. *The Fathers, with reference to Eating and Drinking, distinguish Christ's True Body from his Sacramental one; which they could not do, if Christ's True and Natural Body and Blood were eat and drunk in a proper sense in the Sacrament.*

S. *Chrysostome* (k) expounding those words, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily*, &c. says, *As Christs Presence, which brought those great and unspeakable Blessings to us, did condemn those the more that did not receive it; so also the Mysteries make way for greater Punishments to those that unworthily partake of them.*

(k) *In* 1 *Cor.c.* 11. *v.* 29. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ, &c. Τοὺς μὴ δεξαμένους αὐτὴν μᾶλλον κατέκρινεν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ μυστήρια μείζονος ἐφόδια κολάσεως γίνηται τοῖς ἀναξίως μετέχουσι.

S. *Austin* (l) (whose words I have given *Chap.* 10. *Posit.* 2.) makes the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be *exhibited in the Truth* at his Passion, and *in the Sacrament only the Memory of it to be celebrated.*

(l) *Contr. Faustum l.*20.*c.*21. Hujus sacrificii caro & sanguis, &c. —in passione Christi *per ipsam veritatem* reddebatur, post ascensum Christi *per Sacramentum memoria celebratur.*

Bede (m) upon those words, *The Poor shall eat and be satisfied*, says, *By this Bread and Wine, which are visibly offered to them, they will understand another invisible thing*, viz. *the true Body and Blood of our Lord, which are really Meat and Drink, not such as fills the Belly, but which nourishes the Mind.*

(m) *In Psal.* 21: —Intelligent in pane & vino visibiliter sibi proposito aliud invisibile, scilicet corpus & sanguinem verum Domini, qui verus cibus & potus sunt, quo non venter distenditur, sed mens saginatur.

And in another place (n) speaking of the Passover. *The Immolation of this Passover represents the Glory of our Resurrection, when all the Elect shall eat together the Flesh of the Immaculate Lamb, I mean of him who is our God and Lord, no more in Sacrament as Believers, but in the thing it self, and in Truth, as Spectators.*

(n) *In Esdram lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. Immolatio Paschæ gloriam insinuet resurrectionis, cùm omnes electi carne agni immaculati, id est, Dei & Domini nostri, non amplius in Sacramento credentes, sed in reipsa ac veritate videntes, reficiuntur.

Neither

Neither is that of *Iſidore* of *Sevil* (*o*) to be paſſed over, who mentions this Prayer in the Liturgy of his Time; *That the Oblation which is offered to God, being ſanctified by the Holy Spirit, may be conformed to the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* Which very Phraſe ſhews a difference betwixt what we receive in the Euchariſt, and the true Body and Blood of Chriſt: Elſe it would not be *Conformity*, but *Identity*, as Monſieur *Claude* has well obſerved.

(*o*) *De Officiis Eccleſ. l.* 1 *c.* 15.

—Ut oblatio quæ Domino offertur ſanctificata per ſpiritum ſanctum, corpori & ſanguini Chriſti. *conformetur* (*not* confirmetur, *as the laſt* Colen Edition *abſurdly has printed it*, An. 1617.)

3 Conſideration. *They ſay, That the Fathers under the Old Teſtament did eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat with us; and give this as the Reaſon why it is ſpiritual Meat, Becauſe it is not eaten corporally, but by Faith. Therefore both they and we muſt eat the ſame Meat only ſpiritually, not corporally.*

S. *Auſtin* has ſaid ſo much in this Argument, that I need go no further. And I might inſiſt upon many Paſſages I have upon other occaſions named before; as that in his Treatiſe upon S. *John*'s *Goſpel* (*p*), where explaining that of the *ſame ſpiritual Drink the Fathers drank*, he has ſuch Expreſſions as theſe. *See the Signs are varied, Faith remaining the ſame. There the Rock was Chriſt* (in Sign); *to us, that which is laid on the Altar is Chriſt*; *and they drank of the Water that flowed from the Rock, for a great Sacrament of the ſame Chriſt*; *what we drink, the Faithful know. If you regard the viſible Species or Nature, it is another thing*; *if the ſpiritual or intelligible Signification, they drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink.*

(*p*) *Tract.* 45. *in Ev. Joan.* Videte, fide manente, ſigna variata. Ibi petra Chriſtus, nobis Chriſtus quod in altari Dei ponitur. Et illi pro magno Sacramento ejuſdem Chriſti biberunt aquam profluentem de petra, nos quid bibamus norunt fideles. Si ſpeciem viſibilem intendas aliud eſt; ſi intelligibilem ſignificationem eundem potum ſpiritualem biberunt.

In another place (*q*). *Their Meat and Drink was the ſame with ours in Myſtery*; *not in Subſtance* (or Species) *the ſame, but in Signification. Becauſe the ſame Chriſt who was figured to them in the Rock, is manifeſted to us in the Fleſh.*

(*q*) *Idem in Pſal.* 77. Idem in myſterio cibus & potus illorum qui noſter, ſed ſignificatione idem non ſpecie. Quia idem ipſe Chriſtus illis in petra figuratus, nobis in carne manifeſtatus eſt.

To add but one place more, which fully comprehends the whole ſenſe of the Argument (*r*): Where S. *Auſtin* explaining the ſame words, of *our Fathers eating the ſame ſpiritual Meat*, &c. he diſcourſes thus.

(*r*) *De Utilit. Pœnitentiæ*, cap. 1.

The

Apoſtolus dicit, Patres noſtros, non patres infidelium, non patres impiorum manducantes & morientes, ſed patres noſtros, patres fidelium, ſpiritalem cibum manducaſſe, & ideo eundem.—— Erant enim ibi quibus plus Chriſtus in corde quam Manna in ore ſapiebat. Quicunque in Manna Chriſtum intellexerunt, eundem quem nos cibum ſpiritalem manducaverunt.——Sic etiam eundem potum, *Petra enim erat Chriſtus.* Eundem ergo potum quem nos, ſed ſpiritalem, id eſt, qui fide capiebatur, non qui corpore hauriebatur.——Eundem ergo cibum ſed intelligentibus & credentibus; non intelligentibus autem, illud ſolum Manna, illa ſola aqua, &c.

The Apoſtle ſays, That our Fathers, not the Fathers of Unbelievers, not the Fathers of the Wicked, that did eat and die; but our Fathers, the Fathers of the Faithful, did eat ſpiritual Meat, and therefore the ſame.— For there were ſuch there, to whom Chriſt was more taſteful in their Heart, than Manna in their Mouth.— Whoſoever underſtood Chriſt in the Manna, did eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat we do.— So alſo the ſame Drink, For the Rock was Chriſt. *Therefore they drank the ſame Drink we do, but ſpiritual Drink, that is, Drink which was received by Faith, not what was ſwallowed down by the Body.——They ate therefore the ſame Meat, the ſame to thoſe that underſtand and believe; but to them that do not underſtand, it was only that Manna, only that Water, &c.* Here you ſee, S. *Auſtin* calls that Spiritual Drink *which Faith receives, not which the Body takes down.* And thus whether Chriſt *be come*, or be *to come*, it's all one (as he ſays a little after, *Venturus & venit diverſa verba ſunt ſed idem Chriſtus*) becauſe Faith can apprehend *what ſhall be*, as well as *what is.* But if our Eating be Chriſt's natural Body ſwallowed down our Bodies, then their Meat and ours were not the ſame. For Chriſt could not be thus their Meat, becauſe then he had not taken Fleſh upon him; therefore thoſe old Fathers could not take it down in the *oral Senſe.*

4 Conſideration. *The Body and Blood are to be eaten and drunk, and to be received, as they are repreſented and ſet before us in the Sacrament. But there the Body of Chriſt (according to the Fathers as well as the Scriptures) is ſet before us as broken and dead, and his Blood as poured out of his Veins. Therefore it can be eaten and drunk by us only figuratively and ſpiritually.*

If the Reader look back to *Chap.* 10. *Poſit.* 4. he will find a great many Teſtimonies, eſpecially out of S. *Chryſoſtome*, to prove that the Fathers conſidered Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament as ſlain and dead, and his Blood poured out of his Veins, and ſeparated from his Body: And how S. *Chryſoſtome*, at the ſame time when he tells us that Chriſt has *given us leave to be filled with his Holy Fleſh* (*i*), *he has propoſed and ſet himſelf before us as ſlain.*

This I ſhall now give a further account of, ſeeing the Fathers ſpeak nothing more plainly and fully than this.

(*i*) *Hom.* 51. *in Matth.* —Τῶν ἀγίων σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ ἐμπλησθῆναι δέδωκεν ἡμῖν —— ἑαυτὸν παρέσχε τεθυμένον.

S. *Auſtin*

S. *Austin* (*t*) not only tells us in general, That *we are fed from our Lord's Cross, because we eat his Body*; but more expresly says (*u*), *That Christ offered himself a Sacrifice for us to God the Father, on the Table of the Cross, giving to his Catholick Church a vital Banquet*, viz. *by satiating us with his Body, and inebriating us with his Blood.* But all this, by looking upon him on the Table of the Cross, sacrificed and slain.

This made *Gr. Nyssen* (*x*) say, That *the Body of the Victim* (speaking of Christ) *is not fit for eating, if it be alive.*

And S. *Cyprian* (*y*). *Neither should we be able to drink the Blood of Christ, unless it were first trodden and pressed.* Alluding to Grapes in a Wine-press; and that Christ's Blood must be out of his Veins when we drink it, and so considered by us.

But none of the *Ancients* has given a fuller Account of this than *Hesychius* (*z*), who says, That *Christ made his Flesh fit to be eaten after his Passion, which was not fit to be eaten before his Passion: For if he had not been crucified, we could by no means eat the Sacrifice of his Body. But now we eat Food, receiving the Memory of his Passion.*

And again (*a*), he compares the Cross to a *Gridiron, which when our Lord's Flesh is put upon it, makes it fit to be Food of Men: For unless it had been laid thus upon the Cross, we could in no wise mystically have received Christ's Body.*

And because this Food, which is thus *mystically to be eaten*, could not be fit Food for us, unless Christ was crucified and slain; therefore in several places he speaks of Christ as slaying himself in the Eucharist (which cannot be understood properly) before he was slain upon the Cross. Thus he says (*b*), *Christ, by way of anticipation, slew* (or sacrificed) *himself in the Supper of the Apostles, which they know that perceive the Virtue of the Mysteries.*

Again (*c*). *Our Lord first supping upon the figurative Lamb with the Apostles, did afterwards offer his Sacrifice, and a second time, as a Lamb, slew himself.*

S And

(*t*) *In Psal.* 100. Nos de cruce Domini pascimur; quia corpus ipsius manducamus.

(*u*) *Serm.* 9. *de* 40. *edit. à Sirmondo.* — Qui se pro nobis in mensa crucis obtulit sacrificium Deo Patri, donans Ecclesiæ suæ Catholicæ vitale convivium, corpore suo nos videlicet satians, & inebrians sanguine.

(*x*) *Orat.* 1. *in Resurr. Dom.* Οὐ γὰρ ἦν τὸ σῶμα ἱερείου πρὸς ἐδωδὴν ὀπτήδειον εἴπερ ἔμψυχον ἦν.

(*y*) *Lib.* 2. *Ep.* 3. Nec nos sanguinem Christi possemus bibere, nisi prius calcatus fuisset & pressus.

(*z*) *Com. in Lev. l.* 1. — Carnem ejus, quæ ad comedendum inepta erat ante passionem — aptam cibo post passionem fecit. Si enim non fuisset crucifixus, sacrificium corporis ejus minimè comederemus. Comedimus autem nunc cibum, sumentes ejus memoriam passionis.

(*a*) *Ib. l.* 2. Sartaginem, Domini crucem, — accipi oportet, quæ etiam superimpositam Dominicam carnem, esibilem hominibus reddidit. Nisi enim superimposita fuisset cruci, nos corpus Christi nequaquàm mysticè percepissemus.

(*b*) *Ib. l.* 1. Præveniens, seipsum in cæna Apostolorum immolavit, quod sciunt qui mysteriorum virtutem percipiunt.

(*c*) *Ib. l.* 2. Prius figuratam ovem cum Apostolis cænans Dominus posteà suum obtulit sacrificium, & secundò sicut ovem seipsum occidit.

And now after all these Testimonies and Considerations, which, put together, demonstratively conclude against any eating of Christ's Body, or drinking his Blood, but what is *spiritual and figurative*; I'll put an end to this Chapter with two remarkable Sayings of S. *Austin*.

(*d*) *In Ps.* 98. The first is upon the 98 *Psalm* (*d*), where he confutes those who, when our Saviour spake of *eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood*, were offended at this, as an hard Saying; and then expounding that which Christ added, *The words I speak are Spirit and Life*, he makes our Lord speak thus to them: *Understand spiritually what I have spoken. You are not to eat this Body which you see, nor to drink that Blood which they shall shed that will crucifie me. I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which if spiritually understood, will give Life to you; and if it be necessary this Sacrament should be visibly celebrated, yet it must be invisibly* (*i. e.* spiritually) *understood by you.* No Protestant could chuse Words to express his Mind more fully by, in this Matter.

Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis & bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos; & si necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi.

His other Saying is against the *Manichees*, who fansied a *latent Christ* in the Fruits of Trees, and Ears of Corn, and professed to eat him that was *passible* with their Mouths. S. *Austin* thus sarcastically derides them (*e*): *Ye expect with open Mouth, who should bring in Christ into your Jaws, as the best Sepulcher for him.*

(*e*) *Contr. Faustum l.* 20. *c.* 11. Ore aperto expectatis quis inferat Christum, tanquam optimæ sepulturæ, faucibus vestris.

If S. *Austin* had been for *Oral Manducation* of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, he could not have had the confidence to have objected this, as a Reproach to the *Manichees*, which might so easily have been returned with shame upon himself.

I conclude therefore, that the *Trent Fathers*, when they called the *Sacramental* and *Oral Manducation*, *real eating*, to distinguish it from the *spiritual eating*; and made that *Canon* (*f*), *If any shall say, That Christ exhibited in the Eucharist, is only* spiritually *eaten, and not also sacramentally and* really, *let him be Anathema:* that herein they were so far from designing to testifie their *Consent* with the Fathers (who, as you have heard, generally say the contrary) that they seem rather to have had a *Conspiracy* against them.

(*f*) *Conc. Trid. Sess.* 13. *Can.* 8. Si quis dixerit Christum in Eucharistia exhibitum, *spiritualiter* tantùm manducari, & non etiam sacramentaliter ac *realiter*, anathema sit.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

The Thirteenth Difference.

The Fathers aſſert, That the Faithful only eat Chriſts Body, and drink his Blood in the Euchariſt, not the wicked. Whereas they of the preſent Roman Church extend it to both.

THIS Aſſertion, being a neceſſary conſequence of the foregoing one, will make my work the ſhorter for its proof.

What the Church of *Rome* holds in this matter, cannot be queſtioned. The *Trent Catechiſm* ſpeaking of ſuch a Perſon that makes no diſtinction betwixt the Sacrament and other common food, expreſſes it thus (*g*). —— *Who impurely taking the Body of the Lord, which lies hid in the Euchariſt* —— there it is hid, they mean, under the ſpecies, and the wicked take it.

Therefore *Dom. Soto* (who was one of the Council of *Trent*) ſays (*h*); *We muſt undoubtedly hold, that the Body of Chriſt deſcends into the ſtomach, tho' a wicked man takes it.*

So *Aquinas* (*i*). *Seeing the Body of Chriſt always remains in the Sacrament, till the Sacramental Species are corrupted, it follows, that even wicked men do eat the Body of Chriſt.*

Alenſis (*k*) taking notice of the opinion of ſome that thought that as ſoon as the Body of Chriſt was touched by a Sinners lips, it withdrew it ſelf, ſays, *This is an errour, and manifeſtly againſt the Saints; and therefore it is held commonly, that in this there is no difference betwixt the juſt and unjuſt, for both of them receive the very Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament.*

And a little after. *It muſt be granted, that the wicked receive* the thing which the Sacrament *is a ſign of, which is Chriſts true Body, born of the Virgin,* &c.

(*g*) *Catechiſ. ad Paroch. Part.* 2. *n.* 27. —— Qui impurè ſumens corpus Domini, quod in Euchariſtia occultè latet —

(*h*) In 4. *diſt.* 12. *qu.* 1. *art.* 3. — Eſt indubiè tenendum quòd corpus (ſc. Chriſti) deſcendit in Stomachum, etiamſi ab iniquo ſumatur.

(*i*) *Part.* 3. *queſt.* 80. *art.* 3. *concluſ.* Cùm corpus Chriſti in Sacramento ſemper permaneat, donec ſpecies Sacramentales corrumpantur, etiam injuſtos homines Chriſti corpus manducare conſequitur.

(*k*) *Part.* 4. *Qu.* 11. *memb.* 2. *art.* 2. *ſec.* 2.

—— Illud ſentire erroneum eſt & manifeſtè contra ſanctos: & ideo communiter tenetur quod in hoc non eſt differentia inter juſtum & injuſtum, quia uterq; ipſum verum corpus Chriſti ſumit in Sacramento, &c.

—— Unde concedendum, quod mali ſumunt *rem Sacramenti*, quod eſt corpus Chriſti verum, quod natum eſt de Virgine, &c.

This ought not to ſeem a ſtrange Doctrine to be held by thoſe, who ſay that brute Creatures may devour Chriſts Body. Which is the current opinion.

So *Aquinas* (*l*). *We muſt ſay, that altho' a Mouſe or a Dog ſhould eat a conſecated Hoſt, yet the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body do's not ceaſe to be under the ſpecies, ſo long as the ſpecies remain.*

(*l*) *Loc. citat. ad Tertium.* Dicendum, quod etiamſi mus vel canis hoſtiam conſecratam manducet, ſubſtantia corporis Chriſti non deſinit eſſe ſub ſpeciebus, quamdiu ſpecies illæ manent.

Alenſis (*m*) is as poſitive and more plain. *If a Dog or a Hog ſhould ſwallow a whole conſecrated Hoſt, I ſee not why nor how the Body of our Lord would not, together with the Species, be conveyed into the Belly of that Dog or Hog.*

(*m*) *Ibid. ſec.* 1. *loco citat.* Si canis vel porcus deglutiret hoſtiam conſecratam integram, non video quare vel quomodo Corpus Domini non ſimul cum ſpecie trajiceretur in ventrem canis vel porci.

It is alſo remarkable, that among three Articles which *P. Gregory* XI. *an.* 1371. prohibited to be taught (*n*) under pain of Excommunication (which was alſo repeated by *P. Clement* VI.) one of them was this. *If a Conſecrated Hoſt ſhould be gnawed by a Mouſe, or taken by a Brute, that then the ſpecies remaining, the Body of Chriſt ceaſes to be under them, and the ſubſtance of the Bread returns.*

(*n*) *See Pref. to the determ. of Fo. Pariſ. p.* 32. Si hoſtia conſecrata à mure corrodatur, ſeu à bruto ſumitur, quod remanentibus ſpeciebus, ſub iis deſinit eſſe Corpus Chriſti, & redit ſubſtantia Panis.

This he would not let paſs for good Divinity.

Nor can it at this Day, when this is one of the *Cautions* to be obſerved in the Celebrating of the Maſs.

(*o*) *De Defect. Miſſæ, ſec.* 10. *n.* 5. *ante Miſſal. Roman.* Si poſt conſecrationem ceciderit muſca, aut aliquid ejuſmodi, & fiat nauſea Sacerdoti, extrahat eam & lavet cum vino, finitâ Miſſa comburat, & combuſtio ac lotio hujuſmodi in Sacrarium projiciatur. Si autem non fuerit nauſea, nec ullum periculum timeat, ſumat cum ſanguine.

(*o*) *That if a Fly, or any ſuch animal fall into the Chalice after Conſecration, if the Prieſt nauſeats it, then he muſt take it out and waſh it with Wine, and burn it when Maſs is ended, and the aſhes and the waſh be thrown into the H. Repoſitory. But if he do not nauſeate to ſwallow it, nor fears any danger, let him take it down with the Blood.*

What is all this for, but to tell us, that they look upon it ſtill to be *Chriſts Blood*, and that its better it ſhould be in the Belly of a *Prieſt* than of a *Brute*?

So alſo they give us another Caſe. (*p*) *If a Prieſt ſhould vomit up the Euchariſt, and the ſpecies appear entire, they muſt be taken down reverently, unleſs nauſeated; but in that caſe the Conſecrated Species*

(*p*) *Ibid. n.* 14. Si Sacerdos evomat Euchariſtiam, ſi ſpecies integræ appareant, reverenter ſumantur, niſi nauſea fiat: tunc

Species muſt be cautiouſly ſeparated, and put in ſome H. Place, till they are corrupted, &c.

enim ſpecies conſecratæ cautè ſeparentur, & in aliquo loco ſacro reponantur, donec corrumpantur, *&c.*

But I beg the Readers Pardon for preſenting him with ſuch nauſeous ſtuff; God grant that they who thus unworthily repreſent their Saviour, may have grace to repent, that the *thoughts of their hearts may be forgiven them.*

As for the *Fathers*, if by their plain words we can underſtand their ſenſe, they aſſert, that only the Faithful, and not the wicked, eat the Body of Chriſt, and drink his Blood in a *proper ſenſe*

S. *Jerome* (*q*) calls the Fleſh of Chriſt the *food of Believers.*

And *Iſidore of Sevil* (*r*) that it is the *meat of the Saints.* And he adds (which makes it their food, and of none elſe) *which if any one eat, he ſhall not die eternally.* They therefore often call it the *Bread of Life*, and *Life it ſelf.*

S. *Ambroſe* (*s*). *This is the Bread of Life: he that eateth Life cannot die; for how ſhould he die whoſe Food is Life?*

S. *Auſtin* ſays the ſame (*t*). *When Chriſt is eaten, Life is eaten. — When he is eaten he refreſhes.*

Again in another place (*u*) diſtinguiſhing the Portion of Saints and Sinners, he makes the true *Sons of the Church to partake both of the Dew of Heaven, and the fatneſs of the Earth.* This fatneſs of the Earth he explains to be *all viſible Sacraments, for they pertain to the Earth. All theſe*, he ſays, *the good and bad in the Church have in common. For the bad have and partake of the Sacraments, and what the Faithful know made of Bread-Corn, and Wine.*

(*q*) *In Oſeam c.* 8. —— *Cujus caro cibus credentium eſt.*

(*r*) *In Geneſ. c.* 31. — Caro ejus qui eſt *eſca Sanctorum.* Quam ſi quis manducaverit, non morietur in æternum.

(*s*) *In Pſal.* 118. *Serm.* 18. Hic eſt panis vitæ: qui manducat vitam mori non poteſt; quomodo enim morietur, cui cibus vita eſt?

(*t*) *Serm. de verb. Evangel. apud Bedam in* 1 *Cor.* 10. Quando Chriſtus manducatur, vita manducatur — quando manducatur reficit.

(*u*) *Serm.* 44. *de Diverſis.* Filii Eccleſiæ habent à rore cœli & fertilitate terræ, *&c.*

—— à fertilitate terræ omnia viſibilia Sacramenta. Viſibile enim Sacramentum ad terram pertinet. Hæc omnia communia habent in Eccleſia boni & mali. Nam & ipſi habent, & participant Sacramentis, & quod norunt fideles à tritico & vino.

If then the viſible Sacrament, and that which has its original from Earth, be all that evil men partake of, to be ſure they have nothing to do with Chriſt, the Heavenly Bread, or his Body, which (to uſe his Phraſe) do's not *pertain to Earth at all*, but is a *Divine Food.*

Which none has more admirably and fully ſpoke to than *Origen*

Origen (x). Who having ſaid a great deal about Chriſts *Typical* and *Symbolical Body* (which S. *Auſtin* called before the *viſible Sacrament*) he goes on thus. *Many things alſo might be ſaid concerning that word which was made Fleſh, and the true Food, which whoſoever eats ſhall ſurely live for ever, no wicked Man being capable of eating it. For if it were poſſible, that a wicked man, continuing ſuch, ſhould eat him that was made Fleſh, ſeeing he is the Word, and the living Bread, it would not have been written*, That whoſoever eats this Bread ſhall live for ever.

This is that which *Macarius* (y) diſcourſes of ſo largely and piouſly. Telling us, that as a great rich Man, having both Servants and Sons, *gives one ſort of meat to the Servants, and another to the Sons that he begot, who being Heirs to their Father, do eat with him.*—— So, ſays he, *Chriſt the true Lord, himſelf created all, and nouriſhes the evil and unthankful; but the Children begotten by him, who are partakers of his grace, and in whom the Lord is formed; he feeds them with a peculiar refection, and Food, and Meat and Drink, above and beſides other men, and gives himſelf to them that have Converſation with their Father, as the Lord ſays, He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, abides in me, and I in him, and ſhall not ſee death.*

With whom S. *Jerome* (z) agrees, ſpeaking of voluptuous men; *Not being holy in Body and Spirit, they neither eat the Fleſh of Jeſus, nor drink his Blood; concerning which he ſays*; He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life.

S. *Auſtin* alſo (a) ſays. *Of that Bread, and from our Lords own Hand, both* Judas *and* Peter *took a part.*

But then he (b) makes the diſtinction himſelf, that *Judas* received only the *Bread of the Lord*, when the other Diſciples receiv'd the *Bread*

(x) *In Matth. c. 15. v. 15. p. 253. Ed. Huet.* Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος. Πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου ὡς γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ὃν πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν πίστως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀδύνατος δυναμένου φαγεῖν αὐτήν. Εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν τὸν φαῦλον μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

(y) *Homil. 14.*

—— Ἀλλὰ τροφὴν δίδωσι τοῖς δούλοις, καὶ ἄλλα τοῖς ἰδίοις τέκνοις —— Ἐπειδὴ τὰ τέκνα κληρονομεῖ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐσθίει ——

—— Ἰδίαν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ τροφὴν καὶ βρῶσιν καὶ πόσιν, παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκλήρωσε, καὶ δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, &c.

(z) *In c. 66. Eſaiæ.* Dum non ſunt ſancti corpore & ſpiritu, nec comedunt carnem Jeſu, neq; bibunt ſanguinem ejus, de quo ipſe loquitur; *Qui comedit carnem meam & bibit ſanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam.*

(a) *Contra Donatiſt. poſt collat. c. 6.* De ipſo pane & de ipſa Dominica manu, & *Judas* partem & *Petrus* accepit.

(b) *Tract. 59. in Joan. Evang.* Illi manducabant *Panem Dominum*, ille *Panem Domini* contra Dominum, illi vitam, ille pœnam.

Bread that was the Lord. Which is directly contrary to Transubstantiation; for according to that, even such a one as *Judas*, must eat the *Lord*, and no *Bread*, when this Father says, that he ate the *Bread* and no *Lord*.

Neither is S. *Austin* singular in this Phrase of the *Bread of the Lord*, to signifie the *real substance* of that *Element* that is eaten in the Sacrament, and not the *proper Body of Christ*.

For so S. *Jerome* uses it (*c*). When he speaks of *Corn*, of which the *Bread of the Lord is made*.

(*c*) *In Jerem. c.* 31. Confluent ad bona Domini super frumento, de quo conficitur *Panis Domini*.

It is also very observable, that as the *Council of Trent* (as we heard before) makes eating Christ *Sacramentally and really* to be the same, and *spiritual eating* to be of another sort; not *real*, but one would think, rather *imaginary*. On the quite contrary, the Fathers distinguish the *sacramental eating* from the *real*, and make the *spiritual and real* eating to be the same; and they will grant that a bad Man may eat Christ *Sacramentally* (that is, in sign) but not *really*; for so none but the faithful can do it.

For thus S. *Austin* (*d*). *Then will this be, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ will be Life to every one, if that which is visibly taken in the Sacrament, be in the Truth it self spiritually eaten, and spiritually drank.*

(*d*) *Serm.* 2. *de verb. Apost.* Tunc autem hoc erit, id est, Vita unicuique erit Corpus & sanguis Christi, si, quod in Sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritualiter manducetur, spiritualiter bibatur.

Which in another place (*e*) he expresses by the *visible Sacrament*, and the *virtue of the Sacrament*.

(*e*) *Tract.* 26. *in Joan.* Quod pertinet ad virtutem Sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile Sacramentum.

Again most expresly (*f*). *Christ saying*, He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him, *shows what it is*, not sacramentally, *but* really and in truth, *to eat Christs Body, and drink his Blood.*

(*f*) *De Civit. Dei l.* 21. *c.* 25. Ipse dicens, *qui manducat carnem meam & bibit sanguinem meum in me manet & ego in eo*, ostendit quid sit, non *Sacramento tenus*, sed *revera* Corpus Christi manducare & sanguinem ejus bibere.

And therefore in the same Chapter (*g*) speaking of wicked men, he says. *Neither can they be said to eat the Body of Christ, since they are not to be accounted Christs Members.*

(*g*) *Ibid.* Neq; enim isti dicendi sunt manducare Corpus Christi, quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi.

S. *Austin* again distinguishes the *Sacramentum rei* (the Sacrament of the thing) from the *res Sacramenti*, the thing of which it is a Sacrament.

(*h*). *The*

(*h*) *Tract.* 26. *in Joan.* Hujus *rei Sacramentum* — in Dominica Mensa præparatur & de Dominica Mensa sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam; quibusdam ad exitium. *Res vero ipsa* cujus & Sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium quicunq; ejus particeps fuerit.

(*i*) *Catena in Joh.* 6. 49. Ταύτης μὲν τοι τῆς τροφῆς μεταλαβὼν, ἀνώτερος ἔσται τοῦ θανάτου.

(*h*) *The Sacrament of this thing* —— *is prepared on the Lords Table, and received from the Lords Table, to some to Life, and to others to destruction. But the thing it self of which it is a Sacrament, is for Life to every one that partakes of it, and to none for destruction.*

For as S. *Chrysostom* (*i*) phrases it, *He that receives this Bread, will be above dying?*

I will conclude this Chapter with two remarkable places of St. *Austin.*

The first is cited by *Prosper* (*k*) who has gathered S. *Austin*'s Sentences. *He receives the food of life, and drinks the Cup of Eternity, who abides in Christ, and in whom Christ inhabits. For he that disagrees with Christ, neither eats his Flesh nor drinks his Blood; altho' he takes indifferently every day the Sacrament of so great a thing to the Condemnation of his presumption.*

The other place is, upon the sixth Chapter of S. *John* (*l*). *Christ*, says he, *expounded the manner of his assignment and gift, how he gave his Flesh to eat, saying,* He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. *The sign that he eateth and drinketh is this, if he abides in Christ and Christ in him, if he dwells in him and is inhabited by him, if he cleaves to him so as not to be forsaken by him.*

And he concludes with this Exhortation (*m*). *Let all that has been said, Beloved, prevail thus far with us, that we may not eat Christs Flesh and Blood in Sacrament* (or sign) *only*, but *may eat and drink as far as to the participation of the Spirit, that we may remain as Members in our Lords Body, that we may be enlivened by his spirit,* &c.

(*k*) *Lib. Sentent. ex August. sententia* (mihi) 341. vel 339. Escam vitæ accipit & æternitatis poculum bibit, qui in Christo manet & cujus Christus habitator est. Nam qui discordat à Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit; etiamsi tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidiè indifferenter accipiat.

(*l*) *Tract.* 27. *in Joan. in initio.* Exposuit (*Christus*) modum attributionis hujus & doni sui, quomodo daret carnem suam manducare, dicens, *Qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet & ego in illo.* Signum quia manducat & bibit, hoc est, si manet & manetur, si habitat & inhabitatur, si hæret ut non deseratur.

(*m*) *Ibid. propè finem.* Hoc ergo totum ad hoc nobis valeat, dilectissimi, ut carnem Christi & sanguinem Christi non edamus tantum in Sacramento, quod & multi mali; sed usq; ad Spiritus participationem manducemus & bibamus, ut in Domini corpore tanquam membra maneamus, ut ejus spiritu vegetemur, *&c.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

The Fourteenth Difference.

Several Uſages and Practices of the Fathers relating to the Euchariſt, declare, That they did not believe Tranſubſtantiation, or the Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Body there; whoſe contrary practices or forbearance of them, in the Roman Church, are the Conſequences of that belief. As alſo ſome things the preſent Roman Church practiſes, becauſe they believe Tranſubſtantiation, and the Corporal Preſence, and dare not neglect to practiſe, ſo believing; which yet the Ancient Church did forbear the practice of, not knowing any obligation thereto; which plainly argues their different Sentiments about the Euchariſt in thoſe Points.

IT is poſſible this Argument may have as good an effect to open Mens Eyes, as any I have urged before, tho', I think, I have urged very cogent ones. For tho' ſome Men have a Faculty eternally to wrangle about the Words and Sayings of others, and to ſhift off an Argument of that kind, yet they cannot ſo eaſily get rid of an Objection from Matter of Fact, and a plain Practice. I ſhall therefore try, by ſeveral Inſtances of Uſages and Forbearances, in the caſes above-named, whether we may not ſee as clearly as if we had a Window into their Breaſts, that the Ancient Church, and the preſent Church of *Rome*, were of different Minds and Opinions in this Matter.

1. Inſtance.

It was a part of the Diſcipline of the Ancient Church, to exclude the uninitiated, (Catechumens) *the Energumeni,* (acted by evil Spirits) *and Penitents, from being preſent at the Myſteries, and to enjoin all that were preſent to communicate.*

It is ſo known a Caſe, that the *Deacons* in the Churches cried aloud to bid ſuch depart, as I before named, when they went to the Prayers of the Maſs, (which was ſo called from this diſmiſſion of Catechumens, Penitents, *&c.*) that I

ſhall not ſtay to prove it. (See the Conſtitutions attributed to *Clemens*, l. 8. cap. 6, 7, 9, 12. and S. *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Epheſ.)

By the ſame Laws of the Church, thoſe that remained, after the exclusion of the reſt, were all to communicate; whom the Author of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, under the name of *Dionyſius the Areopagite* (n) calls, *Perſons worthy to behold the Divine Myſteries, and to communicate.*

(n) *Hierarch. Eccleſ.* c. 3. Μόνοις ἢ οἷς ἡ θεία ἐπιτρέπεις καὶ κοινωνίας ἄξιοις.

For this (becauſe it is not ſo univerſally acknowledged as the former) I ſhall refer the Reader to the *Second Canon* of the *Council of Antioch* (o), which ſays, That *they which enter into the Church of God, and hear the Holy Scriptures, and do not communicate in Prayers with the People, or turn away from receiving the Euchariſt through any diſorderlineſs, are to be caſt out of the Church, till they confeſs their Sin and repent*, &c.

(o) *Can.* 2. *Concil. Antioch.* —— καὶ ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τῆς ἀπταξίας, τοῦτο διὰ τοὺς γένεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c.

Which is the ſame in ſenſe with that *Canon* (p) which is very ancient, (tho' not *Apoſtolical*, as it pretends) *That all the Faithful that enter, and hear the Scriptures, and do not continue at Prayer, and alſo at the Holy Communion, are to be ſeparated, as thoſe that bring diſorder into the Church.*

(p) *Canon. Apoſtol.* 9. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσίοντας πρὸς τὸ γραφὰς ἀκούσας, μὴ μένοντας καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ποιοῦντας καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν μετάληψιν ὡς ἀπταξίαν ἐμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή.

S. *Chryſoſtom* diſcharges a great deal of his *Zeal* as well as *Eloquence*, againſt thoſe Perſons that were *preſent* at the Euchariſt, and did *not communicate* (q). *In vain*, he tells them, *do's the Prieſt ſtand at the Altar when none participates; in vain is the daily Sacrifice.*——He minds them, that the *Cryer* had ſaid indeed, That *thoſe that were in penitence* (or penance) *ſhould depart*—— *but thou*, ſays he, *art not of that number, but of thoſe that may participate* (i. e. not being hindred by any Church-Cenſures as Penitents were) *and regardeſt it not.* He ſays, That the King at the Marriage-Supper, *did not ask, Why didſt thou ſit down? but why didſt thou enter?* And adds, *That whoſoever* (being preſent) *does not receive the Myſteries, ſtands there too boldly and impudently.*

(q) *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 3. in *Ep. ad Epheſ.* Εἰκῆ θυσία κατασκευάζεται εἰκῆ περιέρχεται τὸ θυσιαστήριον.——

—ὅτι ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἀπόλυσι πάντες.

—τῶν δυναμένων μετέχειν καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ζεῖ—

—ἀλλ' οὐκ εἶπε, διὰ τί κατέκλισας; ἀλλὰ, πῶς εἰσῆλθες; —πᾶς ὁ μὴ μετέχων μυστηρίων, ἀναιδῶντως καὶ ἰταμῶς ἕστηκε.

dently. The rest is well worthy the reading in that Homily.

Gregory the *Great* also tells us, (r) it was the custom in his Time, for a *Deacon* to cry aloud, *If any do not Communicate, let him depart.* There must be no *Spectators*, that is, unless they were *Communicants.* For as *Justin Martyr* (s) acquaints us, it was the usage of his Time, That *the the Deacons reach to every one present of the consecrated Bread, and Wine, and Water, that they may communicate.*

(r) *Dialog. l. 2. cap. 23.* Si quis non communicat, det locum.

(s) *Apolog. 2.* Οἱ διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος.

If we now look upon the practice of the *Roman Church*, we shall find all quite contrary. There they may have as *many Spectators* as please to come, when there is but *one alone* that *receives* the Eucharist, I mean the *Priest.* Any one that knew nothing of the Matter, would conclude, when he saw their Masses, that they came thither about another Business ordinarily, than to *eat* and *drink* in remembrance of their *Saviour*; which was the only use that the *Ancients* understood of it. *They* considered it as a *Sacrament*, by Institution designed to represent *Christ's Passion and Crucifixion*; *these* consider the presence of his Glorified Body and his Divinity there, and are taken up with *adoration* more than any thing else. *That* they will not abate, *every day* you are present, when the Host is shown for that end: But as for the other, the *receiving* of the Eucharist, they are satisfied if it be done but *once a Year.* The *Ancients* look'd upon it as an Invitation to *a Table*, where the Sacrament was to be their *Meal*; but here you are called to look upon the King *present*, and *sitting in state*; and chiefly to take care that, upon the Sign given, all may *fall down* together and *worship him.*

S. *Chrysostom* (t) calls it, a contumely against him that invites one to Feast, to be present and not to partake of it; and asks, *Whether it had not been better for such a one to have been absent?*

(t) *Loc. citat.* Οὐ βέλτιον ἦν τοιοῦτον μηδὲ παρεγένεσθαι;

But the *Council of Trent* was of another mind, and their Opinion is (u), That *those Masses in which the Priest communicates sacramentally alone, are not to be condemned as private and unlawful, but to be approved and commended.*

(u) *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. c. 6.* Non propterea Missas illas in quibus solus sacerdos Sacramentaliter communicat, ut privatas & illicitas damnare, sed probare, atq; adeo commendare.

And not content with this, they thunder out an *Anathema* (x) againſt thoſe that ſay, (and let S. *Chryſoſtom* look to himſelf) *that ſuch Maſſes are unlawful and to be abrogated.*

(x) *Ibid. Can.* 8. Si quis dixerit Miſſas, in quibus ſolus ſacerdos Sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas eſſe adeoq; abrogandas, anathema ſit.

At theſe Maſſes the *Novices* and *Catechumens* may be preſent, and no *Deacon* cries out to them to withdraw; for tho' indeed they may not *eat*, yet they may *worſhip*: And the *Penitents* that were excluded, while their Penance laſted, from ſo much as ſeeing the Sacrament in the *Ancient Church*; in *this Church*, the oftner they come for this purpoſe, the more welcome; and by direction, when *publick Penance* has been enjoined, the Holy Altar has been the place choſen before which to perform it; as their Annals (y) tells us of one *Sangunus*, a noted Courtier in *Japan*, that for the expiation of a Crime, came and fell down at the Altar, in the Church of the Royal City, and there *before the Holy Sacrament*, claw'd his Back with Scourges ſo long, as one of the Seven *Penitential Pſalms* was recited.

(y) *Annal. Japon. ad An.* 1579.

Theſe Practices, tho' ſo contrary to one another, are yet natural enough, and well-ſuited to the Principles of each Church; but then, it is plain, their Principles and Opinions concerning *the Sacrament*, were widely different; and that ſuch things were never practiſed of old, was not becauſe Chriſtians then wanted *their Devotion*, but *their Faith*.

2. Inſtance.

A ſecond practice of the Chriſtian Church of old, was, *giving the Communion in both kinds*; the *Cup*, that is, as well as the *Bread*; tho' now, by a Law of the Roman Church, (in the Council of *Conſtance* and *Trent*) aboliſhed.

That the *ancient Practice* was to deliver it in both Kinds, has been often proved by *Learned Men* on our ſide, and particularly by an excellent *late Diſcourſe* againſt the Biſhop of *Meaux* (x) upon this Subject; and has been alſo acknowledged by the Learned Men of the *Roman Communion*, ſuch as *Caſſander*, *Wicelius*, *Petavius*, &c. Which makes it needleſs to inſiſt further upon the proof of it.

(x) *Diſcourſe of the Communion in one kind, in Anſwer to the Biſhop of Meaux's Treatiſe.*

We are ſure it continued thus even to the Age when Tranſubſtantion was eſtabliſhed by the *Lateran Council*, ſince we find

find a whole Army of *Charles* King of *Sicily*, (as the Hiſtorian (*a*) tells us) juſt before they went to the Fight againſt *Manfred*, *Ann.* 1265. (or 1266, as other Hiſtorians will have it) *all received the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. *Aquinas* agrees, That *it was the ancient Cuſtom of the Church, That all that communicated of the Body, communicated alſo of the Blood* (*b*). *But for to prevent ſpilling the Blood*, he ſays, *in ſome Churches the practice is, that the Prieſt alone communicates in the Blood, and the reſt in the Body of Chriſt.*

(*a*) *Apud Du Cheſn. Tom.* 5. *Hiſt. Franc. p.* 840. *citante Dalleo, de cultib. Latin. lib.* 5. *c.* 12. Cum exercitus eſſet in procinctu, *Decanum Mildenſim*, aſſociatis ſibi Monachis, corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti regiis militibus dediſſe.

(*b*) *In Joan.* 6. Propter periculum effuſionis.

We ſee then about what time this *grand Sacrilege*, as *P. Gelaſius* calls it (*c*) of dividing one and the ſame Myſtery, made a more publick entry into the Church; it was, when *Tranſubſtantiation* had been newly made an *Article of Faith*; and it was very natural, that *this practice* ſhould, within a while, by eaſy ſteps, be a Conſequent of *that*. For Tranſubſtantiation makes Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood (the ſame which he took of the Virgin, and which he had when he was crucified) to be actually and corporally preſent in the Euchariſt, and that in a glorified State, to which Divine Adoration is due; this is apt to beget a profound Veneration, and a mighty Concern, leſt any thing contumelious ſhould happen to that which Men juſtly account ſo very precious. Now it being certain, that the *Blood* which is under the *Species of Wine*, is ſubject to thoſe Caſualties, by reaſon of its fluidity, which the *other Species* is not ſo liable to; and that in the glorified State, the Body and Blood are inſeparable; and therefore that *one Species* (*viz.* that of the Bread) contains under it both the Body and Blood together; what could be more agreeable to ſuch Sentiments as theſe, than that Men ſhould willingly part with their Right, in a Matter wherein they ſeem not to be much wrong'd (being only deprived of a few Accidents of Wine, when the Blood was ſecured to them) to ſecure the Honour of their Saviour. It is true indeed, that the Stream of the contrary Cuſtom, made it difficult to remove that at once, notwithſtanding this danger of effuſion of the Blood, which they had been wont in all preceding

(*c*) *Speaking of ſome Perſons that taking the Body, abſtained from the Cup of the Holy Blood, ſays*, Aut irtegra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia diviſio unius ejuſdemq; myſterii ſine grandi Sacrilegio non poteſt pervenire. *Apud Gratian. decret.* 3. *part.* 2. *diſt.*

preceding Ages to receive; therefore the Wits of Men being ſet on work by a new Tranſubſtantiating Doctrine, found out ſome new Devices, practiſed firſt in the Cells of the Monks; but afterwards, about the time of *Berengarius*, brought into the Churches to ſecure that dreadful Danger, and yet not deprive the People of communicating in the Blood of Chriſt.

One was the Device of *Intinction*, or ſteeping the Bread in the Wine, and thus receiving both at once, which as Card. *Cuſanus* informs us (*d*) tho' it went not down without great contention at the firſt change from the old Practice, yet the Univerſal Church, complying with the Times, permitted it.

(*d*) Epiſt. 3. *ad Bohem.* Non parva altercatio in principio mutationis illius prioris——— tamen univerſalis Eccleſia, quia ita tempori congruebat, populum cum intincto pane communicare permiſit.

But it was not long it was thus ſuffered, for by a Decree of Pope *Urban* 2. in the Council of *Clermont*, and by an enforcement of it by his Succeſſor P. *Paſchal* 2. (whoſe Epiſtle to *Pontius* Abbot of *Cluny* concerning this Matter, *Baronius* has given us (*e*)) this practice was abrogated.

(*e*) *Baronius Append. ad Tom.* 12. *ad An.* 1118.

A ſecond Device alſo, about the ſame time, was brought into play, *Of ſucking the Conſecrated Wine through little Pipes or Canes* (called *Pugillares*) *like Quills*; concerning which *Caſſander* (*de communione ſub utraq;*) gives us an account, and that ſome of them were to be ſeen in his Time. And indeed, this ſeems to be a ſufficient ſecurity to the danger of Effuſion, and alſo prevents that great Offence of any drops of Blood ſticking to the Beards of People when they drank out of the Cup: and yet even this would not ſatisfy, nor any thing elſe be a ſufficient Caution againſt the prophanation of the Blood, but only debarring the People wholly of it. Yet this way is ſtill uſed by the Pope himſelf, (and I think he has the ſole privilege to do it) who in that which is called the *Miſſa Papalis*, when he himſelf celebrates and communicates, *he ſucks part of the Blood through a golden Quill* *.

* *Cum pontifex Corpus Chriſti ſumpſerit, Epiſcopus Cardinalis porrigit ei calamum, quem Papa ponit in Calice in manibus Diaconi exiſtentis, & Sanguinis partem ſugit.* Sacrarum Cerimon. lib. 2. cap. de Miſſa Majori, Papa perſonaliter celebrante.

But

But neither do's he always thus communicate, for their Book of *Sacred Ceremonies* acquaints us, (**) That when He celebrates perſonally on the Night of the *Nativity of our Lord*, that all things are obſerved, that are deſcribed in the *Papal Maſs*, except that he communicates at the Altar alone, and not in his eminent and high Seat, *and do's not ſuck the Blood with a Quill, but takes it after the common manner.*

** Ibid. cap. Si Papa in nocte Nativitatis perſonaliter celebrat, *Non ſugit ſanguinem cum calamo, ſed more communi.*

But now, after all, what account can we give of the *Ancient Fathers?* they apprehended it neceſſary to receive in both Kinds in all their *Publick Communions*, and ſo they practiſed. Muſt we not then accuſe them, either of great *Dulneſs*, or *Indevotion?* either that they wanted *Sagacity*, in not apprehending the imminent danger they in their way expoſed the Blood of Chriſt to; or that they were guilty of a ſtrange *careleſneſs* and *indifferency*, in not preventing it by any of thoſe Methods which the Roman Church hath found out to do it? Truly, for my part, I am inclined to have as great, if not a greater opinion of them, in both reſpects, (eſpecially for their *Devotion*) than I can have of the *Roman Church*; and I am the more perſwaded hereto, becauſe the Apoſtles themſelves muſt come in to the ſide of the *Ancient Church*, their practice being the ſame: not to inſiſt upon the *Deference* that ought to be paid to that *Holy Spirit* that we are ſure acted *them*; who if there had been any ſuch real danger of prophanation, by receiving in both kinds, or ever was likely to be any ſuch, would not have failed to have given directions *to them* how they ſhould avoid it; and we cannot think the Apoſtles would not have ſet down thoſe Directions *to us* in ſome of their Writings. But they have not done it; no not the Zealous St. *Paul*, who yet ſays ſo much to the careleſs *Corinthians* about this Argument, and tells them, that *they came together, not for the better, but the worſe*; charges them with unworthy receiving, and being *thereby guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, (1 Cor. 11.) and that *for this cauſe many were weak and ſick among them*, and were *judged of the Lord* for their prophanations, &c. But this is none of the Charges againſt them, nor does he direct them to any of the wiſe Methods of the Roman Church for preventing this Danger; tho'

tho' he ſays, What he received of the Lord he delivered to them.

There is nothing then remains, but that we aſſign the true Cauſe of this different Practice; which can be none other, but the Roman Churches *innovating in their Faith* about the Sacrament, and altering ſo their Opinions about the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, that they require a different Conduct for their Devotion; ſo that neither the Practice of the *Primitive Fathers*, nor the Rules of the *Apoſtles*, will ſuit and agree with their Perſwaſions and Apprehenſions. But now the Faith of the *Ancient Church* in this Matter was ſuch, as neither requires nor can admit of any Alteration like what the Church of *Rome* has made in communicating the People only in one Kind. For, as I have before proved, they look'd upon this Sacrament, not as an actual Exhibition and Preſentation of the Natural and Glorified Body of our Saviour, which they believed to be abſent and contained in the Heavens, but as a Repreſentation of his Crucified Body, where his Blood was ſeparated from his Body, and poured out of his Veins; and that not only the *Elements*, but the *Sacramental Actions* of breaking the Bread, and pouring out the Wine, and our eating and drinking were inſtituted to ſhew forth this painful Death of our Lord, and the ſhedding of his moſt precious Blood for the Remiſſion of Sins.

By the preſence of his *glorified Body* there, (as the Roman Church believes) this cannot be done, no breaking, nor no parts to be made of that, nor no ſeparation of Blood, as out of the Body. But all can be done in the *Repreſentative Body* of Chriſt, which is the Euchariſt, all the Ends of the Inſtitution can be there fully effected, and the Sacrifice on the Croſs, in this Image of it, made preſent to our Faith, and to our Minds, and ſet livelily before us; and by the Effects of this upon our Hearts, while we partake of the Elements, through the powerful Grace of God's Holy Spirit, we may be prepared to receive all the Bleſſed Fruits and Benefits of his Paſſion.

According to theſe Perſwaſions, it's plain, there can be no abatement of communicating in the Cup; becauſe, without that, there is no repreſentation of a Crucified Body; for the

diſtinct

distinct partaking of the Blood, (not as supposed to be contained and received in the other Species) is that which alone shows (as I said before) the separation that was then made of his Body and Blood.

3. Instance.

Another Practice of the *Roman Church* differing from the *Ancient*, is, *The Elevation of the Eucharist, that all present may at once adore it.* For thus the Missal (*) directs, That when the Priest comes to the words of Consecration, and has said, *This is my Body*; *then holding the Host*, (as he is directed) *he kneels down and adores it. Then raising himself as high as he is able, he lifts up the Host on high, and fixing his Eyes upon it*, (which he do's also in the Elevation of the Cup) *he shows the Host reverently to the People to be adored.*

This is the present Practice; which the *Council of Trent* (f) endeavours to countenance, by telling us, *That there is no doubt but that all Christians, according to the Custom always received in the Catholick Church, ought to give the Worship of Latria* (which is supreme Worship) *to the most Holy Sacrament in their worship of it.*

By which *Sacrament* (as their best Interpreters explain it) is meant, *Totum visibile Sacramentum*, all that is *visible there*, (together with Christ) and is one entire Object, consisting of *Christ* and the *Species*, and must be together adored. But whatsoever, besides Christ who is invisible, is visible there, call it what you please, is *a Creature*; and I am sure the *Ancient Church* never practised the adoration of any such; and it is strange impudence to talk of the Custom of the *Catholick Church* in this Matter. Neither can it be shown, by any good Testimonies of the *Ancients*, that this *their Elevation*, in order to *Adoration*, was ever used by them: No not so much as *any Elevation* for any purpose, is mentioned by those Fathers, who on set purpose have given an account of the Rites of communicating in the *first Ages* of the Church, neither by *Justin Martyr*, nor the *Author* of the *Constitutions* called *Apostolical*; nor *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, nor the pretended

* *Ritus celebr. Missam cap.* 8. Dicit, *hoc est enim Corpus meum*, Quibus prolatis, celebrans Hostiam tenens inter pollices & indices——genuflexus eam adorat. Tunc se erigens, quantum commodè potest, elevat in altum Hostiam, & intentis in eam oculis (quod in Elevatione Calicis facit) populo reverenter ostendit adorandam.

(f) *Sess.* 13. *c.* 5. Nullus dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in Ecclesia Catholica semper recepto, latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur, *huic sanctissimo Sacramento* in veneratione adhibeant.

Denis the Areopagite, or any other before the *Sixth Century*.

(g) Dallæus de relig. cult. object. l. 2. c. 5.

A dilligent Searcher of Antiquity, tells us (*g*), That he cannot find, among all the Interpreters of Ecclesiastical Offices in the *Latin Church*, the mention of *any sort of Elevation* before the Eleventh Century, (that is, the Age of *Innovation in the Faith* about the Eucharist).

As for the *Greeks* of later date, in them we may meet indeed with *an Elevation* of the Eucharist, but for quite other purposes than *Adoration*. One of the Ends of *their Elevation*, is mentioned by *Germanus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* (*h*), *which was*, to represent *Christ lifted up upon the Cross, and his Death upon it, and the Resurrection it self.*

(h) *In Tom. 2. Bibl. Pat. Gr. Lat.* —Τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὕψωσιν, καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ θάνατον, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀνάστασιν.

Another reason they give is, by the showing of this Food of the Saints, to invite and call them to partake of it. Which *Nic. Cabasilas* gives a full account of (*i*), saying, *That after the Priest has been partaker of the sanctified Things, he turns to the People, and showing them the Holy Things, (i. e.* the Bread and Wine) *calls those that are willing to communicate.* Or, as he still more fully explains it, *The Life-giving Bread being received* (by the Priest) *and shown, he calls those that are likely to receive it worthily, saying, Holy Things are for the Holy* *. *Behold the Bread of Life which ye see. Run therefore you that are to partake of it; but it is not for all, but for him that is Holy*, &c.

(i) *In Expos. Liturg. apud Bibl. Pat. Gr. Lat. Tom. 2.* Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς μεταλὼν τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος ἐπιστρέφεται, καὶ δείξας τὰ ἅγια καλεῖ τοὺς μεταλαβεῖν βουλομένους.

* Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.

It is certain then, that the Roman Practice (when for Adoration they elevate and show the Host) is an Innovation; and that it proceeded from the Novel Doctrines then set on foot in the church, is higly probable; not only because they commenced about the same time; but also because their practice suits so exactly with, and springs so freely from those Doctrines, it being so natural when such a glorious Body as our Saviour's is believed to be made present where it was not before, to be wholly taken up with thoughts of Adoration and Worship above any thing else; as it is notoriously true in this Church, where the main End of the Eucharist, *viz:* communicating

municating in the Body and Blood of Christ is strangely neglected; and they are more concerned, in carrying the Sacrament in Processions, in praying to it before their Altars, in preparing splendid Tabernacles where it may repose, decking and adorning the places of its Residence, and the like, than in engaging Men to *receive it*; which was the main thing the *Ancient Church* designed, that they might worthily partake of it; and when this was not designed, their way was wholly to conceal it.

4. Instance.

Another Practice of the *Roman Church*, different from that of the *Ancient Church*, is, that *now the Communicants Hands are unimployed in receiving the Eucharist; and all is put by the Priest into their mouths.*

Their Hands indeed may bear a part in their Adoration and showing some Signs of that, but otherwise they are useless. For now since Christ's Body is believed to lie hid under the Species of Bread and Wine, that is thought too sacred to be touched by the Hands of any, but the Priests. We may therefore conclude fairly, that if the Fathers had not *this care* to forbid this touching by the Peoples Hands, they had not *this Faith* of the *Roman Church*, that the Natural Body of Christ is in the Eucharist: since if this had been their Opinion, in all probability their practice would have been the same, Since that they had an equal concern for their Saviour's Honour, cannot well be doubted of.

Now that *they* gave the Sacrament into the Peoples Hands, for the space of eight hundred Years or more, is clear by their Testimonies. Of which I'll mention only three or four out of an hundred that might be given.

Clemens of *Alexandria* (*k*) says, That when the Priests have divided the Eucharist, *they permit every one of the People to take a portion of it.*

Tertullian (*l*) reproaches the Christian Statuaries, That *they reached those hands to the Lord's Body, which had made Bodies for Devils.*

(*k*) *Stromat. lib.* 1. Ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσι.

(*l*) *Lib. de Idol. Cap.* 7. —Eas manus admovere Corpori Domini, quæ Dæmoniis corpora conferunt.

St. *Ambrose* (*m*) Story is a known one, how he repelled *Theodosius* from the Holy Table, after the slaughter he had made at *Thessalonica*, with these words; *How wilt thou extend thy hands, yet dropping with the Blood of an unjust slaughter? How with those hands wilt thou receive the Lord's most Holy Body?*

(*m*) Apud Theodoret. Hist. Ecclesiast. Lib. 5. c. 19. —πῶς δὲ τοιαύταις ὑποδέξῃ χερσὶ τοῦ δεσπότου τὸ πανάγιον σῶμα;

He that will consult *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*'s 5*th Mystagogical Catechism*, will find him there directing the Communicant how to order his Hands and Fingers in taking the Sacrament into them. Which a Roman Master of the Ceremonies would not have said a word about, being only concerned about the Mouth.

That this manner of receiving was used in the 9*th* Century, appears by the Capitulary of *Carolus Mag.* (*n*) who ordered, *That all that received the Eucharist* (*acceperint*, that is, into their Hands) *and did not take it* (*sumpserint*, that is, into their Mouths) *should be kept back as sacrilegious Persons.* If they had received it by their Mouths only, this distinction could not have been made.

(*n*) *Capit. Car. M. Lib.* 7. Placuit ut omnes qui Sacram acceperint Eucharistam, & non sumpserint, ut sacrilegi repellantur.

5. Instance.

Another Practice, very unagreeable with the belief of Transubstantiation, is this, That *the Ancient Church was not afraid to administer the Eucharistical Wine in Glass Vessels and Cups:* tho' now it would be a great Crime in the Church of *Rome* to do so.

For that *Ancient Practice*, I might urge that of *Tertullian* (*o*), who reflecting upon the Church's Indulgence to Sinners, mentions the Picture of the Shepherd carrying the Lost Sheep on his Back, drawn on the Chalices, which might be seen by all, being pellucid.

(*o*) *Lib. de pudicit. c.* 7, & 10. Procedant ipsæ picturæ calicum vestrorum, si vel in illis perlucebit interpretatio pecudis illius, utrumne Christiano an Ethnico peccatori de restitutione conliniet.

Cap. 10.—At ego ejus Pastoris Scripturas haurio, qui non potest frangi.

To which he opposes, afterwards, the *Scriptures of that Shepherd that could not be broken.*

As also that of St. *Jerom* (*p*), where speaking of S. *Exuperius*, he says, *Nothing is richer than he who carries the Lord's Body in a wicker Basket, and his Blood in a Glass.*

(*p*) *Epist.* 4. *ad Rusticum.* Nihil illo ditius, qui Corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro.

But

But it is needleſs to add more Teſtimonies, becauſe the thing is confeſſed by *Baronius* (*q*), in his Notes upon the Acts of S. *Donatus*, who confeſſes, That *Glaſs Chalices ſeem to have been in uſe from the Times of the Apoſtles.* And ſays a great deal more than I have mentioned, to confirm it.

(*q*) *Notis ad Martyrol. Rom. in Auguſt.* 7. A temporibus Apoſtolorum vitreus Calix in uſu fuiſſe videtur.

And that this Cuſtom continued long in the Church, may be concluded from hence, That *Baronius* can find no earlier prohibition of it, than that of the *Council of Rhemes*, which he ſays was held in the Days of *Charles the Great.* I have nothing to do with the Commendation he adds of this Prohibition, (being concerned only in the Matter of Fact) ſaying, That it was very *laudable*; but I do not think it was ſo meerly for his Reaſon, [*ob periculum quod imminueret materiæ fragili*] becauſe of *the imminent danger in ſuch brittle Matter.* For if the Cuſtom was as ancient as the Apoſtles, how came they to want that quick Senſe the *Roman Church* now has to prevent that Danger? But we may be certain, that they, and the Church after them, that uſed ſuch Glaſſes, had not the preſent Perſwaſions of this Church, about a *hidden Deity*, and the *latent glorified Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt* in the Euchariſt, elſe they would have had both the *Diſcretion* and *Devotion* to have provided him a better place of reception.

Now they have done it in the *Canon Law* (*r*), enjoining, that the *Cup* and *Patent* be, if not of Gold, at leaſt of Silver, (allowing only Pewter in caſe of great Poverty) but *in no wiſe the Cup muſt be of Braſs or Copper, the virtue of the Wine cauſing a ruſt that procures Vomiting*, (which yet one would think the Blood of Chriſt, where there is no Wine, ſhould not cauſe) *but over a Wooden or a Glaſs Cup, none may preſume to ſay Maſs.* All is very agreeable to their ſeveral Perſwaſions.

(*r*) *Can. at Calix. diſt.* 1. *de Conſecrat.* —De ære aut aurichalco non fiat Calix, quia ob vini virtutem æruginem parit, quæ vomitum provocat. Nullus autem de ligneo, aut vitreo calice præſumat miſſam cantare.

6. Inſtance.

To this let me add another Inſtance, more difficult ſtill to be reconciled with the belief of Tranſubſtantiation, *viz. The mixing the Blood of Chriſt with Ink, for writing things of moment.* So I call the *conſecrated Wine*, according to the uſual Language

Language of the Fathers, giving it the name of *Christ's Blood*; but it's not possible to believe that they who thus used it, thought it to be so, any otherwise than by representation: since you can hardly think of a higher profanation, by any mixture, than this, of blending the true Blood of Christ with Ink, unless I except the case of mixing it with Poison, for the destruction of Persons; and thus *P. Victor* 2. and *P. Victor* 3. and *Henry* 7. Emperor, all died by receiving Poison in the Sacrament, as is attested by numerous and credible Historians.

Taking it therefore for granted, that no Body will have the confidence to assert, that they who thus mixed it with Ink, did believe Transubstantiation, I shall now set down three remarkable Instances of a Pope, a General Council, and a King, that thus used it.

The first is of Pope *Theodorus*, who as *Theophanes* (whose words *Baronius* (s) has given us) relates, when *Pyrrhus* the *Monothelite* departed from *Rome*, and was come to *Ravenna*, and returned like a Dog to his Vomit; *and when this was found out, P. Theodorus Calling a full Congregation of the Church, came to the Sepulchre of the Head of the Apostles, and asking for the Divine Cup, he dropped some of the Life-giving Blood into the Ink; and so, with his own hand, made the deposition of excommunicated Pyrrhus.* Thus *Theophanes.*

(s) *Ad an. D.* 648. *Sec.* 14.

The next Instance, is, the doing of the same in the Condemnation and Deposition of *Photius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, by the Fathers of the *4th Council of Constantinople* (which the Romanists call the *8th General Council*) which is thus related by *Nicetas* in the Life of *Ignatius* (t). *The Bishops subscribed his Deposition, not with bare Ink, but, which may make one tremble (as I have heard it attested by those that knew it) dipping the Pen in the very Blood of our Saviour; thus they condemned and exauthoriz'd* Photius, *and with him, all that had been ordained by him.* All this was *Anno Dom.* 869.

(t) Apud Concil. Labbe. Tom. 8. pag. 1231.
Ὁυ ψιλῷ τῷ μέλανι τὰ χειρόγραφα ποιούμενοι, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρικῶδες ἔστιν, ὡς τῶν εἰδότων ἀκήκοα διαβεβαιουμένων, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ σωτῆρος τῷ αἵματι βάπτοντες τὸν κάλαμον, οὕτως ἐξεκήρυξαν Φώτιον, οὕτως αὐτὸν κατεδίκασαν, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κεχειροτονημένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

The last Example is, of a Peace or Agreement struck up between *Charles the Bald*, and *Bernard* count of *Barcelona*, in in the same Age, related by *Odo Aribert*; (whose Fragment *Baluzius*

Baluzius has given us) (*u*) who tells us, That Agreement at *Tholouſe*, was confirmed and ſigned between the *King* and the *Count*, Sanguine Euchariſtico, *with the Blood of the Euchariſt*. Tho' notwithſtanding this *Charles* ſtabb'd *Bernard* with his own hand.

(*u*) *Notis ad Agobardum*, p. 129.

7. Inſtance.

The next Inſtance ſhall be, The different Practices of the *Ancient Church* and the *Preſent Roman*, with reference to the *Reſervation* of the Euchariſt, after the Communion was ended, and what they did with the *Remains* not received.

Concerning which, for methods ſake, I ſhall refer all to three remarkable differences.

1. Difference.] *What was not received in the Euchariſt by the Communicants, the Ancient Church took no care to reſerve it; But the new Roman Church reſerves all publickly that is unreceived, and puts little of it to any uſes that are Sacramental.*

I will not ſay that there was no reſervation of the Remains, after the Euchariſt was over, of what had been conſecrated, and not received, even before the Innovations took place, which were introduced by the Roman Church, becauſe there may perhaps be ſome Inſtances given of communicating the Sick out of ſuch Remains; and among the *Greeks* there was alſo communicating, *ex præſanctificatis*, of what had been conſecrated before; but theſe, I ſay, were but later Cuſtoms of the *6th* and *7th* Centuries, and both before and after the contrary Cuſtom did prevail; and where theſe Reſervations were, they employed them to the ends of the Sacrament, for to be *eaten* and not to be *adored*.

But as to the moſt Ancient Cuſtom of the Church, it is truly given by the *Author of the Commentary* upon S. *Paul's Epiſtles*, among S. *Jerom's* Works (*x*). Who on thoſe words of S. *Paul* (1 *Cor.* 11.) *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*, &c. ſays thus, *Meeting in the Church, they ſeparately made their Oblations, and after the Communion*, whatſoever *remained of the Sacrifices there in the Church, eating a common Supper, they conſumed them together.*

(*x*) *Tom.* 9. *Edit. Frobn. in* 1 *Cor.* 11. In Eccleſia convenientes ſuas ſeparatim offerebant, & poſt communionem quæcunq; eis de ſacrificiis ſuperfuiſſent, illic in Eccleſia communem cœnam comedentes pariter conſumebant.

But

But when these *common Meals* ceased, and this way of consumption with them; The *Ancient Church* had other ways to do it. Witness the Practice mentioned by *Hesychius* (*y*), who explaining that place of the Law, which required, That *whatsoever of the Flesh and Bread remained, should be burnt with Fire*; adds, *which we see also now sensibly done in the Church; that whatsoever happens to remain* (of the Eucharist) *unconsumed, is burnt.*

(*y*) *Lib. 2. in Levit. cap. 8.* Quod nunc videmus in Ecclesia sensibiliter fieri, igniq; tradi quæcunque remanere contigerit inconsumpta.

Evagerius (*z*) mentions another different usage, but with the same effect, at *Constantinople*, where, he says, *It was an old Custom, that when a great deal of the Holy Parts of the Immaculate Body of Christ our God remained, they sent for some Youths that went to School, of an unripe Age, who eat them up.*

(*z*) Histor. Lib. 4. c. 36. Ἐὸ & πλειὸν —— ὅτ' ἂν πλεῖστ' χρῆμα ἁγ' ἁγίων μελῶν τὸ ἀχράντε σώμα & Χριστῦ τῦ Θεῦ ἡμῶν ἐναπομείνει, παῖδας ἀφθόνως— ταῦτα ἐδέσθαι.

Nicephorus Callistus says, That this continued so to his Time, and that he himself had been one of those Youths that ate up those Particles (*a*).

(*a*) *Lib. 17. Hist. c. 25.*

Neither was this a Practice of the *Eastern Church* only, but also of the *Western*, as appears by a *Canon* of a Synod of *Mascon* (*b*), *An.* 585. *Whatsoever Reliques of the Sacrifices shall remain in the Repository after Mass is ended, on Wednesdays and Fridays the Officer shall bring little Children to Church, and appointing them to Fast, they shall receive the said Remains sprinkled with a little Wine.*

(*b*) *Concil. Matiscon. Can. 6. apud Tom. 5. Conc. Labb. p. 982.* Quæcunque reliquiæ Sacrificiorum, post peractam Missam in Sacrario supersederint, quarta & sexta feria innocentes, ab illo cujus interest, ad Ecclesiam adducantur & indicto eis jejunio easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant.

If Transubstantiation had been their Belief, these had been lewd Profanations of the Lord's Body.

The Roman Church therefore having this Belief, have ordered Matters quite otherwise, all is reserved that remains; the Pretence I know is, that they may have the Sacrament always in readiness to communicate the Sick withal; but they have been often told, that this is altogether needless, when the Priests with their *portable Altars*, have leave, upon less Occasions, to celebrate Mass privately; and when so many hundred Masses in the great Churches are daily celebrated, how easily may the Sacrament immediately (without being reserved)

reſerved) be conveyed from one of their Altars to ſuch ſick Perſons.

But whatſoever is pretended, they intend other things more ſuitable to that *Preſence*, which they ſuppoſe to be there included; ſtately Tabernacles they prepare upon the Altars for his repoſe, with lighted Torches burning Day and Night before it; they come thither, even out of the Times of the Aſſemblies, to make their Proſtrations; for ſo Card. *Bellarmine* (*c*), among the Encouragements to make private Prayers in Temples, gives this as one Reaſon, *becauſe ordinarily in them, beſides the Preſence of God which is every where, there is alſo the Preſence of Chriſt our Mediator corporally in the Euchariſt, which increaſes the Hope and Truſt of him that prays.*

(*c*) *De cultu Sanct. l.* 3. *c.* 4. *S. Quinta ratio.* Quia in Templis ordinariè præter Dei præſentiam, quæ eſt ubique, eſt etiam præſentia Mediatoris Chriſti corporaliter in Euchariſta, quæ certè auget ſpem & fiduciam orantis.

This is a new way of increaſing Faith and Hope, which the *Ancients* were not acquainted with; they waited indeed at the Altar for that end, when the Euchariſt was adminiſtred, and the evident repreſentation and *ſetting forth of Chriſt before their Eyes as crucified*, was very proper to increaſe their Faith and Hope: And there in a *Sacramental* Senſe, while they thus received, in the Phraſe of *Optatus* (*d*), the *Body and Blood of Chriſt did inhabit for certain Moments*. But theſe *certain Moments* will not do the Buſineſs of this Church, which requires a more *conſtant* and *fixed Reſidence*. They do not think their very Temples holy and venerable enough without it; for among the things that make a Temple ſo, and moreover endue it with a kind of a *Divine Virtue*, the forenamed Cardinal (*e*) reckons *the preſence of the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*. So that it ſeems by their Opinions and Practice, the *reſerved parts* of the Sacrament, are as neceſſary as thoſe that are *received*.

(*d*) *Lib.* 6. *adv. Donatiſt.* Quid vos offenderat Chriſtus, cujus illic *per certa momenta* corpus & ſanguis habitabat?

(*e*) *Ibid. cap.* 5. *Sec. Tertio probatur.*

Eſpecially if you remember that theſe *reſerved Parts* are deſigned, not only to receive their *Adorations*, when they come to *ſay their Prayers before it* in the Churches, but alſo when it *travels abroad*, as it do's upon many occaſions, when none have occaſion to receive it, nor think of ſaying their Prayers, being engaged in the Streets about their Secular Affairs;

yet even there, when they happen to meet the Eucharist going in a ſolemn Proceſſion, they muſt kneel and adore it. We know alſo that there is a peculiar Feaſt inſtituted (tho' of a late Date, *An.* 1264.) on *Corpus-Chriſti* Day, on which, with the greateſt pomp and ſtate imaginable, it is carried about the Streets and publick Places to be ſeen and worſhipped. Not to mention ſome extraordinary contingences, ſuch as the breaking out of a great Fire ſuddenly, occaſioning the drawing it out of its Retirement, to oppoſe againſt and ſtop its fury.

Beſides, the Pope himſelf has often need of the *reſerved Hoſt*, not to *Take and eat* (according to the Inſtitution) but to *take along with him* when he, in his Pontificals, rides to any Church, or takes a Journey to a City, this always accompanies him; and the *Book of Sacred Ceremonies*, will give you an account of the Horſe, and the colour of it, upon which it is ſet, with the Bell about his Neck, and the pompous Train, the Canopy carried over it, and lighted Torches before it, &c.

Let me only add farther, That in that caſe which is pretended to be the great occaſion for the reſervation of the Euchariſt, I mean, to be in readineſs for ſick Perſons, yet even here the Proceſſion, and the Pomp, and the Magnificence in the conveying it to ſuch Places, and the Receiving the Adorations of all it meets, ſeems to be as much deſigned, as the communicating thoſe ſick Perſons; which they will be contented as ſoon to let alone, as to abate thoſe attending Ceremonies.

The *Ancient Church* had very *homely practices*; they uſed and ſuffered, in caſes of great neceſſity, things that *this Church* would account incongruous if not profane. Such as that which *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* (*f*) relates concerning *old Serapion*, who when he lay a-dying, ſent a young Grand-child of his to call one of the Presbyters of *Alexandria* to give him the Sacrament: Who by reaſon of Illneſs, not being able to go along with him, he made no more ado, but took a little portion of the Euchariſt, and gave it into the Youth's Hand, and directed him to moiſten it, and ſo to infuſe it into his Mouth; which he did, and immediately upon the ſwallowing

(*f*) *Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* l. 6. c. 44.

ing it, the old Man expired: I Queſtion, whether the Gentlemen of the Roman Church will *allow* this to be a *true Communion*; but I believe, with their perſwaſions, they would not *follow* it for a World.

We may more than gueſs ſo, by a remarkable Story *Nic. Trigantius* tells us of what was reſolved upon by the skilful *Jeſuits*, in a Caſe exactly like the former (*g*), at *Pekin* in *China*; One *Fabius* who had been converted and baptized, being above Eighty Years old, fell ſick to Death; and having been confeſs'd of his Sins, with great earneſtneſs, deſired to receive the Sacrament for his *Viaticum*; but there being no convenient place at his Houſe to celebrate it in, nor liberty to carry it through the Streets in Pomp and requiſite State, they comforted him with the conſideration of his having made confeſſion of his Sins, which was neceſſary; and told him that he might, without taking the Sacrament, when he was lawfully hindred, go to Heaven; and ſo they left him. Theſe admirable Caſuiſts, you ſee, determine againſt communicating the dying Perſon, when it could not be performed with the *majeſtick Ceremonies* they deſired.

(*g*) *Nic. Trigantii* exped. apud *Suar.* l. 5. c. 7. p. 503. Neque domi loco convenienti celebrari poterat, neque pro majeſtate per vicos deferri: ſolabantur igitur illum ſocii neceſſaria peccatorum confeſſione perfunctum, poſſe ſine viatico, quod legitime impeditus minimè ſuſciperet, cœleſtem gloriam introire.

The Prieſt of *Alexandria*, and the Fathers in *China*, differ very widely in their Practice, and you may be ſure their Perſwaſions in this matter were as different; the Man himſelf indeed, he tells us, found a way to get the Communion at laſt, by throwing himſelf into *their Houſe*, but it was not till they had made a little Proceſſion within doors; till the Tapeſtry was ſpread on the Floors, and the Tapers lighted, nothing could be done.

In a word, to perſwade People of the neceſſity of theſe Pomps and Solemnities in conveying the Sacrament to the Sick, they produce ſeveral Miracles *, how when the Prieſts have carried the Euchariſt through Fields without attendance, Troops of Aſſes and Mares have run to ſupply this defect, and having firſt fallen down on their Knees to worſhip the Deity he carried, they have accompanied him to the Place, waited at the ſick Man's Door till all was over, and then marched back again in good order with him; God ſhowing, by theſe reſpects

* *See the* School *of the Euchariſt, Title, Aſſes and Mares,* &c.

respects paid to it by Beasts, what he expected much more from Men.

2. *Difference*, relates to what was received in the Eucharist; wherein we also see a plain disagreement in the usages of the *Primitive*, and the *present Roman Church*. Which is this; The *Ancient Church allowed great Liberty privately to reserve what had been publickly received in the Eucharist: Which would be now a great Crime in the Roman Church*; so far from being allowed.

It is undeniable, that anciently this was allowed, (whether they did well or ill in it is not at all the question, but concerning the Matter of Fact.) *S. Basil* (*h*) thinks that the Custom took its rise from Times of Persecution, when Christians were forced to flee into Desarts, and live in solitude, having not the presence of a Priest to communicate them, they had the Sacrament reserved by them, and communicated themselves. But he says (even when this Reason ceased) this became afterwards an inveterate Custom. And in *Alexandria* and *Egypt*, the *Laicks commonly had the Sacrament by them in their own Houses* (*i*); and, he says expresly, this which they so reserved μετ' ἐξουσίας ἁπάσης, *with all liberty* (as his Phrase is) *was a Particle received from the Priest's Hand in the Church.*

(*h*) *Epist.* 289.

(*i*) *Ibid.* Καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τελούντων, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ.
—ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπιδίδοσι τὴν μερίδα, &c.

(*k*) Orat. 11.
Καὶ εἴπου τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος, ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν, &c.

So *Nazianzen* (*k*) says of his Sister *Gorgonia*; *Whatsoever of the Antitypes of the precious Body and Blood of Christ her Hand had treasured up*, &c.

Which very phrase intimates, that at several times she had reserved and made a collection of the Consecrated Elements.

Tertullian supposes it a common practice in his time, when he says (*l*), *Thy Husband will not know what it is thou tastest secretly before all other Meat*, &c.

(*l*) *Lib.* 2. *ad Uxor.*
Non sciet maritus quid secretò ante omnem cibum gustes, &c.

It is true indeed that in the Councils of *Saragosa* and *Toledo* in *Spain*, this was prohibited in the 4*th* Century, upon occasion of the *Priscillianists*, who did receive the communion as others did, and reserved it, and so could not be discovered, tho' they

they never took it; against whom Learned Men think those Councils made those Canons, which anathematized those that received, but did not take it down, but reserved it. However the foresaid Custom still prevailed in other Places, as might be shown, if it were needful, as far as the 11*th* Century. As for the *present Church* this is wholly a Stranger to them; they will have no Remains kept any where but upon the publick Altars, where no Hand must touch them but the Priest's. The Council of *Trent* (*m*) will not allow the *Sanctimoniales*, the very *Nuns* in their Quires, or in any places within their Cloister (*intra chorum vel septa Monasterii*) to keep it by them, but only *in publica Ecclesia*, notwithstanding any former Grants and Privileges. And a Great Man (*n*) speaking of the former Usages, says, *If any Lay-man now should dare to do so, he would be accounted guilty of a Crime to be expiated by a grievous punishment, as a profane Violator of the most Holy Sacrament.*

(*m*) *Sess.* 25. *cap.* 10.

(*n*) *Petavius de Pœnit. l.* 1. *c.* 7. Si quis nunc Laicus simile quid auderet, is apud nos censeretur gravi pœna expiandi criminis reus, veluti sanctissimi Sacramenti profanus temerator.

But if it be so great a Crime with them to reserve it when they have received it; What will they say to the next Difference I shall now mention?

3. *Difference.* That *among the Ancients, what was so privately reserved, was put to such uses as the present Roman Church must abhor, because they are direct Affronts to the belief of Transubstantiation, and the corporal Presence.*

It appears by *S. Cyprian*, (*libr. de Lapsis*) that the very Women in his Time had liberty to take the Eucharist home with them, and dispose of it as they pleased; and the Woman he there speaks of, that *lock'd it up in her Chest*, had not the Roman Opinion of a Latent Deity, which such usage ill agrees with, or rather affronts.

Neither had *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* (*o*) *their* Perswasions, when he advises his Communicant, *whilst his Lips were wet and dewy*, with what he had drank in the Cup, with his Hands to touch his Eyes and Forehead, and the rest of the Organs of his Senses for their Sanctification.

(*o*) Catech. Mystag. 5. Ἔτι δὲ νοτίδος ἐνούσης τοῖς χείλεσί σου.

But what *Gorgonia*, *Nazianzen*'s Sister, did with the Remains of the Antitypes of Christ's Body and Blood, exceeds it; when

when as he reports of her, to her commendation (p), ſhe mixed them with her Tears, and anointed her whole Body with it, for the recovery out of a grievous Diſeaſe.

(p) Orat. 11. Φαρμάκῳ τούτῳ τὸ περὶ σῶμα ἐπελείψατο, &c.

A like Story to which, S. *Auſtin* gives us (q) of the Mother of one *Acatius*, who was born with cloſed Eyes, which a Phyſician adviſed ſhould be opened with an Inſtrument of Iron; but ſhe refuſed, and cured him with a *Cataplaſm, or Plaſter made of the Euchariſt.*

(q) *Lib.* 3. *ſecundi op. adv. Jul.* Neq; hoc permiſiſſe religioſam matrem ſuam, ſed id effeciſſe ex *Euchariſtiæ cataplaſmate.*

In honour to our Saviour, we find a Woman anointing his Body; but to make his Body an Ointment for hers, or to make it into a Medicine, is but courſe uſage of it, and ſuch as none would adventure upon that was perſwaded it was a deified Body.

The old Cuſtom which *Euſebius* mentions (r) of ſending the Sacrament from one Biſhop to another, as a Token of Peace and Communion, ſeems to argue but little good Manners, (with the Church of *Rome*'s Opinions concerning it); for tho' God ſent his Son on a bleſſed Errand and Embaſſy, it looks too ſaucy for us to ſend him on ours.

(r) Lib. 5. Hiſt. Eccleſ. c. 24. Ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ μὲν πιστοῦντες οἱ τοῖς σῶ πρεσβύτεροι, τοῖς ἀπὸ Φρ πανταχῶν πιστοῖς ἔπεμπον ἐυχαριστίαν.

What Indecencies would *this Church* juſtly fear the Body of Chriſt would be ſubject to, if there were that permiſſion that was granted of old to carry the Euchariſt along with them in their Voyages at Sea? Yet this P. *Gregory* the Great tells us was practiſed by *Maximianus* and his Companions returning from *Conſtantinople* to *Rome*; and being in a Tempeſt in the *Adriatick* Sea (s), *They gave one another the* Pax, *received the Body and Blood of their Redeemer, recommending every one himſelf to God.*

(s) *Dial. l.* 3. *c.* 36.—Sibimet pacem dediſſe, corpus & ſanguinem Redemptoris accepiſſe; Deo ſe ſingulos commendantes.

But that which S. *Ambroſe* informs us (t) of his Brother *Satyrus*, was ſtill more bold; *Who being Shipwrack'd at Sea, and not yet having been baptized, leſt he ſhould die without the Myſtery, he begg'd of ſome of thoſe that were baptized, to let him*

(t) *Orat. de obitu fratris.* Priuſquamperfectioribus eſſet initiatus myſteriis, in naufragio conſtitutus——ne vacuus myſterii exiret è vita, quos initiatos eſſe cognoverat, ab his Divinum illud fidelium ſacramentum popoſcit——ligari fecit in orario, & orarium involvit in collo, atq; ita ſe dejecit in mare.

him have that Divine Sacrament of the Faithful, (the Cuſtom then being to have it reſerved about them) *which they granting, he put it up in his Handkerchief which he then tied about his Neck, and ſo threw himſelf into the Sea.*

Whatſoever Conceits *Satyrus* might have when he borrowed it, yet thoſe that beſtowed it, could never think fit (with the foreſaid belief) to deliver it into the Hands of one not yet a perfect Chriſtian, nor to be tied about his Neck in a cloth that I ſuppoſe was no Corporal (as they call it) to be expoſed to the daſhing of Sea-waves, like a Bladder or a Cork to keep him from drowning.

But there is a more irreconcileable Practice of the Ancients with the preſent Belief, with which I ſhall end this Particular about *reſervation* of the Sacrament. It *is the Cuſtom* of burying the *reſerved* parts of it with their dead Bodies. The Author of the Life of S. *Baſil* (*u*), tells us, That *he kept a Particle of the Euchariſt to be buried with him*; and left it ſo to be by his laſt Will.

(*u*) Vita Baſil. c. 6. Τῶν δὲ (μερίδα) ἐφύλαξεν συνταφιάσαι αὐτῷ.

St. *Gregory* (*x*) tells a ſtrange Story of a Youth that was a *Monk*, who going out of S. *Benet*'s Monaſtery without his Benediction, ſuddenly was found dead; and being buried, the next day was forced out of his Grave, and a ſecond Time was found ſo after Burial: Whereupon, ſays he, they ran weeping to S. *Benet*, praying him to beſtow his Bleſſing upon him. To whom that Man of God gave the Communion of the Lord's Body, ſaying, Go and lay this Body of our Lord upon his Breaſt, and ſo bury him. They did ſo, and then he kept in his Grave, and the Earth threw him out no more.

(*x*) *Dialog. l. 2. c. 24.* —Quibus vir Dei manu ſua protenſus communionem Dominici corporis dedit, dicens, Ite atq; hoc Dominicum corpus ſuper pectus ejus ponite, & ſic ſepulturæ cum tradite. Quod dum factum fuiſſet, ſuſceptum corpus ejus terra tenuit, nec ultra projecit.

I know that there are ſeveral *Canons of Councils*, made againſt this Practice, (as the 20*th Canon* of the *Council of Carthage*, and the 83 *Canon* of the 6*th General Council at Conſtantinople* in *Trullo*); upon which *laſt Canon*, *Zonaras* obſerves, ὡς καὶ πολλαχοῦ, &c. *That it was an ancient Cuſtom to deliver the Lord's Body to Dead Bodies.*

But then methinks it's very obſervable, that the reaſon why the *Fathers* prohibit it, is not ſuch a one as would be given in

in the *Roman Church*, from the horrible Profanation and contumely in thus using the Lord's Body (as it would be if it were truly and properly there, and no Bread remaining): But their Reason is from hence, *Because it is written, Take and eat; But dead Carcases can neither take nor eat.*

But notwithstanding all these Prohibitions, the old Custom continued afterwards; for those that write the Lives of Saints, and tell us of the translating of their Bodies from one place to another, inform us that they have found pieces of the Eucharist uncorrupted lying in their Grave: As *Surius* (y) tells us in the Life of *Othmarus*, That when he came to be translated some Years after he was buried, they found under his Head, and about his Breast, little pieces of Bread, which were with much reverence laid by his Body again.

(y) *Surius vit. Othmar. ad Nov.* 16. Eas venerabiliter assumens sacro corpori apposuit.

The like do's *Amalarius* (z) report, (citing *Bede* for it) that the same was practised when *S. Cutberd* was buried, *his Head bound with a Napkin, the Eucharist laid upon his Holy Breast, with his Sacerdotal Habit upon him*, &c.

(z) *De div. Offic. l.* 4. *c.* 42. Oblata super pectus Sanctum posita, vestimento Sacerdotali indutum, &c.

It is little less than a Demonstration, that they that thus treated the Sacrament, did not believe it contained a *hidden Deity* under the *species of Bread and Wine*; for sure they would not then have thus used the Lord of Life and Glory, to imprison him, as it were, and suffer him to lie buried with the putrid Carcases of the Dead.

8. Instance.

The last Instance of differing Practices in the two Churches, shall be, *In their over-sollicitousness to prevent any Accidents that might happen in the Administration of the Eucharist; their Frights when any such thing do's happen, and the Expiations required for negligence to purge such Crimes; such as we have no foot-steps of in any of those cases, in the Ancient Church.*

As to the first of those Cases, I have somewhat prevented my self, in what I before have shown, of their Devices of *Intinction*, sucking the Sacrament *through Pipes*; and, which is worst of all (out of this abundant caution) *denying the People the Cup*. Here therefore I shall mention *other Cautions*, such as those which tend to prevent any *Fragments* falling off from

from the *Bread of the Euchariſt*, that no *Crumbs* may have any diſhonour done to them, by being left unregarded, but either may be received or reſerved.

To this end, they have altered the *Ancient Cuſtom* of providing *common Bread*, ſuch as is of ordinary uſe, for the Sacrament, and required that it be *unleavened*, becauſe this is leſs apt to break into *Crumbs*, and cleaves better together in its Parts. And tho' they do not ſay that there is no Sacrament where leavened Bread is uſed, yet the *Miſſal* (*a*) affirms, That he *that conſecrates in this, do's grievouſly Sin*; and herein they have raiſed (ſince the days that Tranſubſtantiation was forming into a Doctrine of Faith) and maintained a great Controverſy with the *Greek Church*, which do's not uſe their *Azyms*, no more than the *Ancient Church* did. They have alſo invented, about the ſame Time, and ſtill uſe, thoſe little *round Wafers* (as they are commonly called) which is that which they conſecrate for the Bread of the Sacrament, and take care hereby to prevent breaking into *Crumbs*; for they never break them for diſtribution, but put them whole into the Communicants Mouths; whereas the *Ancient Practice* was, to provide one whole Loaf of Subſtantial Bread, and to divide this into parts, and break it for to be diſtributed among them all. But theſe *Hoſtiola*, little Hoſts, are brought to ſuch a tenuity, that they are the next door to what they call *ſpecies*, having ſcarce any ſubſtance, and *deſerve not properly* the name of Bread, as a learned Man (*b*) has ſhown. The very *Miſſal* (*Loc. citat. n.* 7.) ſuppoſes, that they may eaſily diſappear, and that a *Wind may* carry them away, for that is one of the caſes it mentions, (*aut vento, aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta.*)

(*a*) *De defectibus, c.* 3. *n.* 3. *Conficiens graviter peccat.*

(*b*) *Voſſius de Theſ. Theol. Diſp.* 19. *de S. Cœnæ Symb.*

It is eaſy to ſhow, that all this caution to prevent *falling Crumbs*, is perfect nonſenſe, according to their principles, ſince the True Body of Chriſt cannot be broken or crumbled into Bits, which is the only ſubſtance remaining; the reſt, which they call *Species*, being Mathematical Lines and Colours only, and no matter under them; a *whole World* of them can never make up a *Crumb of Bread*, or any Fragment. And yet theſe are they about which ſuch ſuperabundant Caution is uſed; which are mentioned in the *Miſſal*.

To name a few. When the Prieſt that celebrates do's communicate himſelf, it is then only that he breaks the Hoſt into three parts, one of which he puts into the Cup; and after he has taken the other two which are upon the *Patin*, he is directed (*c*) *to take the Patin, to view the Corporal*, (or Cloth ſpread under it) *to gather up the Fragments with the Patin, if there be any on it, and with his Thumb and Fore-finger of his right Hand, to wipe the Patin carefully over the Chalice, and alſo his Fingers, leſt any Fragments remain on them.*

(*c*) *Miſſal. Rom. ritus celebr. Miſſam, c.* 10. *Sect.* 4.

Then for the Hoſts that are reſerved to another time, after the Prieſt has taken them off from the Corporal, and put them into the Veſſel appointed for them, he is directed *to mind carefully* (*d*), *leſt any Fragment, the leſt imaginable, remain upon the Corporal; and if there be any, carefully to put them into the Chalice.*

(*d*) *Ibid. Sect.* 15.

When he has taken the Cup, with the 3*d* Particle of the Hoſt put into it (*e*), *he muſt purify himſelf, drinking ſome wine poured into the Cup by the Miniſter* that attends; *then with Wine and Water muſt waſh his Thumbs and Fore-fingers over the Cup, and muſt wipe them with the Purificatory; then he muſt drink off the Oblation* (wherein he waſhed) *and wipe his Mouth and the Chalice with the Purificatory.*

(*e*) *Ibid. Sect.* 5.

Such-like alſo are the Cautions given when the People have communicated *. *If the Hoſts were laid upon the Corporal, the Prieſt wipes it* (or ſweeps it) *with the Patin; and if there were any Fragments on it, he puts them into the Chalice. The Miniſter alſo holding in his right Hand a Veſſel with Wine and Water in it, and in his left a little Napkin* (Mappulam), *do's reach the Purification* (to waſh their Mouths) *to them, a little after the Prieſt, and the little Napkin to wipe their Mouths.*

* *Ibid. Sect.* 6.

The Communicants alſo are directed (*f*), after receiving, *not preſently to go out of the Church, or talk, or look about careleſly; nor to ſpit, nor read aloud Prayers out of a Book, leſt the Species of the Sacrament ſhould fall out of their Mouths.*

(*f*) *See the Rom. Ritual, de S. Euchariſt.*

All this is preventing Care: But now when Accidents do happen, they ſeem, by their ordering Matters, to be in a *frightful Concern*; and ſtrange things are to be done, if poſſible, to make an honorable amends.

In

In the laſt Chapter I have given the Reader ſome Inſtances of thoſe ſtrange Things, and will here only add two Caſes which the Roman Miſſal provides for.

The firſt is, *If a Conſecrated Hoſt, or any part of it, ſhould fall to the Ground,* the direction is (*g*), *That it be reverently taken up, and the place where it fell muſt be cleanſed, and a little ſcraped away, and ſuch duſt or ſcrapings muſt be put in the Holy Repoſitory. If it fell without the Corporal upon the Napkin* (Mappam) *or any ways upon any Linen Cloth, ſuch Napkin, or Linen, muſt be carefully waſhed, and that Water poured out into the Holy Repoſitory.*

(*g*) *Miſſal. Rom. de defect. Miſſæ, c.* 10. *Sect.* 15.

The ſecond Caſe is, *When by negligence* (*h*) *any thing of the Blood is Spilt. If it fell upon the Earth, or upon a Board, it muſt be licked up with the Tongue, and the place ſcraped ſufficiently, and ſuch ſcraping be burnt, and the Aſhes laid up in the Repoſitory. But if it fell upon the Altar-ſtone, the Prieſt muſt ſup up the Drop, and the place be well waſhed, and that water caſt into the Repoſitory. If it fell upon the Altar-Cloths, and the Drop ſunk as far as the ſecond or third Cloth, thoſe Cloths muſt be thrice waſhed where the Drop fell, putting the Cup underneath* to receive the Water, *and that Water thrown into the foreſaid place.* And ſo it directs to ſuch waſhing when it falls upon the Corporal alone, or the Prieſt's Garments, *&c.*

(*h*) *Ibid. c.* 10. *Sect.* 12.

I cannot but here annex alſo the Conſtitution which the Reader may find in the *Appendix* to the *Hiſtory of the Church of Peterburgh*, Pag. 344. (being the firſt of two there ſet down) directing what is to be done, when any negligence happens about the Lord's Body and Blood, and how to expiate the Crime.

" When there is ſo great negligence about the Lord's Body " and Blood, that it happens to fall downward, or into any " place where it cannot be fully perceived, whether it fell, " and whether any of it came to the Ground; Let the Mat- " ter be diſcovered as ſoon as may be to the Abbot or Prior, " who taking ſome of the Friars with him, let him come to " the place where this has happened; And if the Body ſhall " have fallen, or the Blood have been ſpilt upon Stone, or " Earth, or Wood, or Mat, or Tapeſtry, or ſuch like, let " the duſt of the Earth be gathered, part of that Stone be " ſcraped, part of that Wood, Mat, Tapeſtry, or the like,

" be cut away and caſt into the Holy Repoſitory. But if the " place where it fell cannot be plainly diſcovered, and yet it " appear that it fell downwards, in that place, and about the " place where it is thought chiefly to have fallen, let there be " the like gathering, Scraping, cutting away, and caſting in- " to the Holy Repoſitory. Then they by whoſe negligence " this has happened in the next Chapter ſhall humbly declare " their Fault, and on their naked Bodies receive Judgment " (*judicium nudi ſuſcipiant*) and Penance be enjoined them, " either of Faſting, or Whipping, or Rehearſing ſo many " Pſalms, or ſuch like. Which Perſons going back to their " places, from their Puniſhment (*de judicio*) all the prieſts " then preſent ſhall riſe up, and with all devotion offer them- " ſelves to receive Puniſhment. Then he that holds the " Chapter, ſhall detain ſeven of them, which he pleaſes to " chuſe, to receive the Judgment (of *whipping*) and command " the reſt to go away. The Chapter being ended, all pro- " ſtrating themſelves together, ſhall ſay ſeven Penitential " Pſalms in the Monaſtery, beginning to ſing them as they go " out from the Chapter. Then ſhall follow after the Pſalms, " the *Pater Noſter*, with theſe Chapters and Collects. *Let* " *thy Mercy, O Lord, be upon us. Remember not our Iniquities.* " The Lord be with you. Let us pray. *Hear, O Lord, our* " *Prayers, and Spare the Sins of thoſe that confeſs themſelves to* " *thee; that they whoſe guilty Conſciences do accuſe them, thy mer-* " *ciful Pardon may abſolve them.* Or that other Collect. *O God,* " *whoſe property is always to have Mercy*; or ſuch other collect " for Sins.

" But if the Blood fell upon the Corporal, or upon any " clean Cloth, and it be certain whether it fell, let that part " of the Cloth be waſh'd in ſome Chalice, and the firſt Wa- " ter it was waſh'd in be drunk off by the Friars; the other two " waſhings be caſt into the Repoſitory. The ſaid Fault " muſt be diſcovered in the firſt Chapter, but they alone, by " whoſe negligence this has happened, ſhall receive the fore- " ſaid Diſcipline, but all the Friars ſhall ſay over in the Mona- " ſtery all the ſeven Pſalms, with the Chapters and Collects, " as was ſaid before. If that day, the ſhort one for the Dead " ſhall be read in the Chapter, let them firſt ſing my words " going into the Church: After that the ſeven Pſalms, as aforeſaid.

"aforeſaid. But if in any other manner a lighter negli-
"gence ſhall happen relating to this Sacrament, the Friar,
"by whoſe Fault it happened, ſhall be puniſhed with a ligh-
"ter Revenge at the diſcretion of the Abbot or Prior.

Thus I have given a ſufficient Specimen of the ſtrange Caution and Fears the Roman Church are under, leſt any thing ſhould happen, even to the very leaſt Particle or Drop of the Sacrament, that is diſhonourable: And indeed, their Caution is very agreeable to their Perſwaſions, as I have before often hinted.

But now if we turn our Eyes upon the *Ancient Church*, tho' we cannot queſtion, either their Devotion or reverent Behaviour in all Acts of Religious Worſhip, and particularly in this great One; yet there is not to be found any ſuch *ſcrupuloſities* about *minute things*; nor ſuch *frightful apprehenſions* in the caſe of unforeſeen Accidents, nor ſuch *Expiations* as we have before heard of. They did not forbear to uſe the *Common Bread* (as I ſaid before) tho' it might be more liable to crumble; they took their Share from one *Common Loaf*; they received the Wine without *intinction*, or *ſucking it through Pipes*, &c. Which are all later Inventions, ſince the Faith was innovated concerning the Euchariſt.

But becauſe this is only a Negative Argument, I will therefore add a Poſitive one, to demonſtrate that the *Ancients* were far from theſe Scrupuloſities; and alſo that they came into the Church with Tranſubſtantiation, and not before; *viz. The Practice of Communicating Infants.* It is not my Buſineſs here to prove, that this was the common Uſage in the Church, from the Times of S. *Cyprian* at leaſt, even to later Ages, which has been done effectually by others (*i*), and is acknowledged by our Adverſaries.

(*i*) *See Mr.* Chillingworth's *Additional Treatiſes, in 4to.*

Maldonate (*k*) the Jeſuit owns, that it continued in the Church for ſix hundred Years.

(*k*) *Comm. in Joan. 6. 53.*

And Card. *Perron* (*l*) grants, *That the Primitive Church gave the Euchariſt to Infants as ſoon as they were baptized:* And that *Charles the Great*, and *Lewis the Pious*, *both teſtify that this Cuſtom remained in the Weſt in their Age*, that is, in the 9*th* Century in which they lived. But it went down lower, even to two Ages after *Charles the Great*. For that.

(*l*) *De loc. Auguſt. c.* 10.

that Epiſtle of P. *Paſchal* 2. (which I mentioned in another Chapter) given us by *Baronius*, at the end of his *laſt Tome*, (*Ad Ann.* 1118. when that Pope died) wherein he forbids *Intinction* of the Bread in the Wine, and requires that the Bread and Wine ſhould be *taken ſeparately*; gives us alſo this exception, (*præter in parvulis ac omnino infirmis qui panem abſorbere non poſſunt*) that *it may be allowed to little Children, and thoſe extreamly weak, that cannot get down the Bread:* Which had been a needleſs proviſion for them, if Infants had not then received the Sacrament.

This being then a certain and confeſſed thing, that Infants received the Euchariſt, I refer it to the Conſcience of any *Romaniſt*, whether he can think the *Ancients* had any of their aforeſaid Fears, and nice Scrupuloſities, about the Accidents that might happen to the conſecrated Elements, which in that Practice could not be prevented; it being impoſſible, where ſucking Children receive either Bread or Wine, to hinder the happening of ſomething which the Church of *Rome* will call highly diſhonourable to the Sacrament. For to inſtance in a Caſe which S. *Cyprian* (*m*) mentions, of a Chriſtian little Girl, that by her Nurſes Wickedneſs had receiv'd polluted Bread in an Idol's Temple, and afterwards was brought by the Mother, knowing nothing, into the Church to receive the Communion. He relates how the Child, when its turn came to receive the Cup, turned away its Face, ſhut its Lips, and refuſed the Cup. *But the Deacon* (*n*) *perſiſted, and though it ſtrove againſt it, did infuſe into it of the Sacrament of the Cup. Then followed ſighing and vomiting; the Euchariſt could not remain in a Body and Mouth that had been prophaned.*

(*m*) *Lib. de Laſſis.*

(*n*) *Ibid.* Perſtitit Diaconus, & reluctanti licet de Sacramento Calicis infudit. Tunc ſequitur ſingultus & vomitus; in Corpore atq; ore violato Euchariſtia permanere non potuit.

How would a Romaniſt ſtart at the thoughts of pouring the Sacrament, as this Deacon did (who ſure was a *Zuinglian*) into the Mouth of a ſtrugling Child? But here is no mention of any concern about that, or what happened upon it; from whence it is natural to conclude, that the *Ancients* in this common Caſe having none of this Church's *Scruples* and *Fears*, that they had none of their *Faith*; for they muſt have had more *Caution*, if they had had their *Opinion* about the Euchariſt.

It

It is alſo very obſervable, to confirm what I have ſaid, that though we can trace the Cuſtom of *Communicating Infants*, as far as to the Age when the Tranſubſtantiating Doctrine was ſet on foot, and ready to be formed into an Article of Faith; yet here we are at a full ſtop, and can go no further, for this begat ſuch Scruples and Fears, that made this quickly give place and vaniſh, which had ſo many Hazards attending it, and we hear no more of it ſince that in the *Latin Church*; but other great Churches, that have not made This an Article of their Faith, ſtill retain the old Cuſtom (though they err therein) of Communicating Infants. As the *Greek Churches*, the *Muſcovites*, *Armenians*, *Habaſſins*, *Jacobites*, &c. concerning which ſee *Dallée de Cultib. Latin.* l. 5. c. 4. *Thomas à Jeſu de Converſ. gentium*, l. 7. c. 5. & c. 18. *Ludolfi Hiſtor. Æthiop.* l. 3. c. 6. Sect. 37, 38. *Hiſtor. Jacobitarum*, *Oxon.* cap. 9. See alſo *Father Simons* Critical Hiſtory of Religions, concerning the *Georgians*, cap. 5. p. 67, 71. *Neſtorians*, p. 101. *Cophtites*, p. 114. *Armenians*, c. 12. p. 128.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The Fifteenth Difference.

The Old Prayers in the Canon of the Mass concerning the Sacrament, agree not with the present Faith of the Roman Church: And their New Prayers to the Sacrament have no countenance from the Ancient Church.

IT is to no purpose to enquire, who was the Author of the *Canon of the Mass*, when *Wallafridus Strabo* (*o*) (who lived in the middle of the 9*th* Century) tells us, *It was a thing to him unknown.* Seeing also he adds, *That it had been enlarged, not only once but often*; it is as vain to ask after its Age.

(*o*) *De reb. Ecclesiast. cap.* 22. Quis primus ordinaverit nobis ignotum est.

Auctum tamen fuisse, non semel sed sæpius ex partibus additis intelligimus.

(*p*) *Berno Ab. Augiens. de rebus ad Missam spectant. c.* 1. Attamen ipsum Canonem non unus solus composuit totum, sed per tempora aliud alius interposuit vel adjecit.

The same also the Abbot *Berno* (*p*) says, *It was not one Man that composed the Canon all of it, but at several times another interposed and added another thing.*

And as they added, so also I doubt not but they altered many things, as we may guess by that remarkable Difference, betwixt what the Author of the Book of Sacraments, under the name of S. *Ambrose* (*q*), cites as the Prayer in his Time, and what we now find in it. (speaking of the Oblation) it was, then, Make this Oblation to us allowable, rational, acceptable, *Which is the Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ our Lord:* Which now is turned into this Prayer, That the *Oblation may be made to us the Body and Blood of thy dear Son our Lord.*

(*q*) *Lib.* 4. *de Sacram. cap.* 5. Fac nobis hanc Oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, *Quod est Figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

Quam Oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæsumus benedictam, adscriptam, &c. facere digneris, *Ut nobis corpus & sanguis fiat dilectissimi tui Filii D. N. J. Christi.*

But yet to take the *Canon* as now it is, we shall find the Prayers of it, not capable of being reconciled with the present Faith of the Roman Church, and with Transubstantiation.

To

To give ſome Inſtances.

Thus they pray in the *Canon*, immediately after the words of Conſecration.

Wherefore we, O Lord, thy Servants, and yet thy Holy People, being mindful, as well of the Bleſſed Paſſion, as alſo of the Reſurrection from the Dead, and of the glorious Aſcenſion into Heaven, of the ſame thy Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; do offer to thy moſt excellent Majeſty, out of thy own Donations and Gifts, a pure Sacrifice, an Immaculate Sacrifice, the Holy Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup of Everlaſting Salvation.

Upon which (Gifts) vouchſafe to look, with a propitious and ſerene Aſpect: and to accept them, as thou didſt vouchſafe to accept the Gifts of thy Child, the Righteous Abel, *and the Sacrifice of our Patriarch* Abraham; *and the Holy Sacrifice, the immaculate Hoſtie, which thy High Prieſt* Melchiſedeck *did offer to thee.*

Almighty God, we humbly beſeech thee, command theſe things to be carried by the Hands of thy Holy Angel to thy High Altar, before thy Majeſty, that as many of us, as by this partaking of the Altar, have received the moſt holy Body and Blood of thy Son, may be filled with all Heavenly Benediction and Grace, by the ſame Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

Vouchſafe alſo to beſtow on us Sinners —— ſome part and ſociety with thy Holy Apoſtles, &c. —— into whoſe ſociety we intreat thee to admit us, not weighing our Merit, but beſtowing Pardon on us. Through Chriſt our Lord.

By whom, O Lord, thou doſt always create, ſanctify, quicken, bleſs, and beſtow on us all theſe good things.

Can. Miſſ. Unde & memores, Domine, nos ſervi tui, ſed & plebs tua ſancta ejuſdē Chriſti Filii tui D.N. tam beatæ paſſionis, necnon & ab inferis reſurrectionis, ſed & in cœlos glorioſæ aſcenſionis; *Offerimus præclaræ majeſtati tuæ de tuis donis ac datis, Hoſtiam puram, hoſtiam immaculatam, Panem ſanctum vitæ æternæ, & Calicem ſalutis perpetuæ.*

Supra quæ propitio ac ſereno vultu reſpicere digneris: & accepta habere, ſicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui juſti Abel, & ſacrificium Patriarchæ noſtri Abrahæ, & quod tibi obtulit ſummus Sacerdos tuus Melchiſedeck, ſanctum Sacrificium, immaculatam Hoſtiam.

Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, jube hæc perferri per manus ſancti Angeli tui in ſublime Altare tuum, in conſpectu Majeſtatis tuæ, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione Sacroſanctum Filii tui corpus & ſanguinem ſumpſerimus, omni benedictione cœleſti & gratia repleamur. Per eundem J. Chriſtum D. N.

Nobis quoque peccatoribus — partem aliquam & ſocietatem donare digneris cum tuis ſanctis Apoſtolis — intra quorum nos conſortium, non eſtimator meriti ſed veniæ, quæſumus, largitor admitte. Per Chriſtum D. N.

Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, ſemper bona creas, ſanctificas, vivificas, benedicis & præſtas nobis.

Immediately after all have communicated, this follows.

Quod ore ſumpſimus, Domine, purâ mente capiamus: & de munere temporali fiat nobis remedium ſempiternum.

What we have taken with our Mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure Heart: and of a temporal Gift, may it be made to us an Eternal Remedy.

While the Prieſt is waſhing his Thumbs and Fore-fingers over the Cup, with Wine and Water, and wiping of them; he is bid to ſay;

Corpus tuum, Domine, quod ſumpſi, & ſanguis quem potavi, adhereat viſceribus meis: & præſta ut in me non remaneat ſcelerum macula, quem pura & ſancta refecerunt Sacramenta.

Qui vivis, &c.

Let thy Body, O Lord, which I have taken, and thy Blood which I have drunk, cleave to my Entrals, and grant that the ſtain of my Crimes may not remain in me, whom pure and Holy Sacraments have refreſhed.

Who liveſt, &c.

All theſe Prayers I have cited, the Reader muſt remember are *after Conſecration*; upon which immediately, according to the preſent Faith of the Roman Church, the Subſtance of Bread and Wine is deſtroyed, and nothing but the Species and Shadows of them remain; and now Chriſt, inſtead of them, becomes preſent there in his Body, and Soul, and Divinity. This is their Faith. But it is impoſſible to reconcile this to thoſe foregoing Prayers. For at the beginning of the *Canon*, they pray, * That *God would accept and bleſs theſe Donations and Gifts, theſe holy undefiled Sacrifices*; that is, the Oblations of Bread and Wine, which are no more than ſo, till the words of Conſecration.

* Supplices rogamus ac petimus uti accepta habeas & benedicas, hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc ſancta ſacrificia illibata.

After this (as you heard) they pray, That *this Oblation may be made to us, the Body and Blood of thy dear Son Jeſus Chriſt.* Which do not imply a change of Subſtances; for thoſe words *(fiat nobis) be made to us*, may very well conſiſt with the Oblations remaining in Subſtance what they were before, only beging the Communication of the Virtue and Efficacy of Chriſt's Paſſion to themſelves.

And that this is the ſenſe of the *Canon*, appears by thoſe words after Conſecration, when they ſay, *We offer to thy Majeſty a pure Sacrifice of thy Donations and Gifts.* Which words plainly

plainly suppose, that they are in Nature what they were, *God's Creatures* still, not the appearance and shadow of them only. But they call them now the *Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup of Salvation*; because, after they are blessed and made Sacraments, they are not now to be look'd upon as bodily Food, but as the Food of our Souls, as representing that Body of Christ, and his Passion, which is the Bread of Eternal Life.

If they had understood nothing to remain now after consecration, but Christ's *Natural Body*, they would not have called this *thy Gifts* in the Plural Number, but expressed it in the Singular, *thy Gift*. Neither can they refer to the remaining Accidents, because they are no *real Things*, and rather tell us what God has *taken away*, (the whole Substance of them) than what he has given.

But then what follows, puts it out of all doubt *; *Upon which* (still in the Plural) *look propitiously*. If it had been, *Look upon us propitiously for the sake of Christ*, it had been well enough. Or, to desire of God to look *upon these things propitiously which they offer*; if they mean (as he that made the Prayer did) that God would accept this Oblation of Bread and Wine, as he did of *Abel* and *Melchisedeck*, (which latter was indeed Bread and Wine) this had been very proper. But to make that which we offer to be Christ himself, (as they that believe Transubstantiation must expound it) and to desire God to look propitiously and benignly *upon him*, when there can be *no fear* that he should ever be unacceptable to his Father, nor none can be *so foolish* as to think that Christ stands in need of our recommendation to God for acceptance, this sense can never be agreeable to the Prayer. Therefore the most Ancient of all the *spurious Liturgies*, I mean, that attributed to *Clemens* in his *Constitutions* (r), has given us the true sense of it; *We offer to thee this Bread and this Cup —— and we beseech thee to look favourably upon these Gifts set before thee, O God, who standest in need of nothing; and be well pleased with them for the honour of thy Christ*, &c.

* Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris.

(r) Lib. 8. c. 12. Προσφέρομέν σοι —— τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο. —— καὶ ἀξιοῦμέν σε, ὅπως ἱλεῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου ὁ ἀπροσδεὴς Θεὸς καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, &c.

Would it not run finely, to pray that God would be well pleaſed with Chriſt, for the honour of his Chriſt?

But beſides the Petition, that God would look propitiouſly upon them, it follows in *the Canon*, *That God would accept them, as he did the Gifts of* Abel, *and* Abraham, *and* Melchiſedeck. How unagreeable is this (if Chriſt himſelf be underſtood here) to make the Compariſon for acceptance, betwixt a Lamb and a Calf, or Bread and Wine, and Chriſt the Son of God, with whom he was always highly pleaſed.

But then what follows ſtill entangles Matters more in the *Church of Rome*'s Senſe. The Prayer, That God *would command theſe things to be carried by the hands of his Holy Angel to the High Altar above.* For how can the Body of Chriſt be carried by Angels to Heaven, which never left it ſince his Aſcenſion, but is always there? Beſides the *High Altar above*, in the Senſe of the *Ancients*, is Chriſt himſelf. And *Remigius* of *Auxerre* tells us (*s*), That S. *Gregory*'s Opinion of the Sacrament was, That *it was ſnatched into Heaven by Angels, to be joined to the Body of Chriſt there.* But then in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiation, what abſurd ſtuff is here to pray, that Chriſt's Body may be joined to his own Body? So that there can be no ſenſe in the Prayer, but ours, to underſtand it of the Elements offered devoutly, firſt at this Altar below, which by being bleſſed become Chriſt's Repreſentative Body, and obtain acceptance above through his Interceſſion there. And thus it is fully explained, by the Author of the *Conſtitutions* (*t*); *Let us entreat God, through his Chriſt, for the Gift offered to the Lord God, that the good God, by the mediation of his Chriſt, would receive it to his Cœleſtial Altar, for a ſweet ſmelling Savour.*

(*s*) *De celebrat. Miſſa in Bibl. Pat. 2da Edit. Tom. 6. p. 1164.*
In Cœlo rapitur miniſterio Angelorum conſociandum corpori Chriſti.

(*t*) Lib. 8. c. 13. in initio.
Διαιτῶμεν τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὑπὲρ τῆς δοθείσης τῷ ἁγιάσματι τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅπως ὁ ἀγαθὸς Θεὸς προσδέξηται αὐτὰ διὰ μεσιτείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὑπερκόσμιον αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας.

To put the Matter further out of all doubt, it is obſervable, that the *Liturgies* that go under the name of S. *James*, and S. *Mark*, do both of them mention the acceptance of the Gifts of *Abel* and *Abraham*, and the admitting them to the *Celeſtial Altar*, before the reciting the words of the *Inſtitution*,

ſtitution, or *Conſecration*, (as the Roman Church calls them, by which they ſay the Change is made). That the *Liturgy* of S. *Chryſoſtom* prays, That *God would receive the Oblations propoſed to his Superceleſtial Altar*, almoſt in the ſame words, both *before* and *after Conſecration*; and that he look'd upon them to be the ſame in ſubſtance that they were before, plainly appears by an expreſſion after all, where he prays (*u*), That *the Lord would make an equal diviſion of the propoſed Gifts to every one for good, according to every Man's particular need.* Which cannot be underſtood of Chriſt's proper Body, (but of the conſecrated Bread and Wine) which cannot admit of ſhares or Portions, equal or unequal.

(*u*) Σὺ τὸν Κύριον τὰ προκείμενα πᾶσιν ἡμῖν εἰς ἀγαθὸν ἐξομάλυνον, κατὰ τὴν ἑκάστου ἰδίαν χρείαν.

Laſtly, That S. *Baſil*'s *Liturgy* alſo, *before the Conſecration*, prays, That the Oblations may be carried unto the *ſuperceleſtial Altar*, and be accepted as the Gifts of *Abel*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, &c. And to ſhew that even *after* the words of Inſtitution, he did not believe them to be other things than they were *before*, he ſtill calls them the *Antitypes* (*x*) *of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*; and prays, That *the Spirit may come upon us and upon the Gifts propoſed, to bleſs and ſanctify them, and to make this Bread the venerable Body of our Lord God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and this Cup his Blood, the Spirit working the change.*

(*x*) Προσφέροντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. —— ἐλθεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ, καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα, &c.

And afterwards the Prieſt prays (*y*), *That by reaſon of his Sins, he would not divert the Grace of his Holy Spirit from the propoſed Gifts.* A needleſs fear, if the Gifts were already Chriſt's Body, that the Spirit ſhould be hindred from coming upon that, where all the Fulneſs of the God-head dwells bodily, by any Man's Sins.

(*y*) Μὴ διὰ τὰς ἡμᾶς ἁμαρτίας κωλύσῃς τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου πνεύματος, ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα.

The next Paſſage of the *Canon* increaſes ſtill the difficulty to them that believe Tranſubſtantiation. When it ſays, *Through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, by whom, O Lord, thou doſt always create, ſanctify, quicken, bleſs and beſtow all theſe good things on us.* If there be no good thing remaining in the Euchariſt beſides Chriſt, when theſe words are ſaid, What Senſe or Truth is there in them? Can Chriſt, or his Body that already exiſts, be created anew, and be always created? Can

Can that be always *ſanctified*, that was never *common*? Or, is he to be raiſed and quickned anew daily, that once being ſo raiſed, can die no more? *&c.* But that which makes the Abſurdity of this Interpretation the greater, is, that they ſay that all this is done *to Chriſt by Chriſt* himſelf; as if God *by Chriſt* did *create Chriſt*; and *by Chriſt*, did *bleſs*, and *quicken*, and *ſanctify Chriſt*; which none but he that is forſaken of common Senſe can affirm.

(z) *In Bibl. Patr. Tom. 6. p.* 1165. Per Chriſtum Deus Pater hæc omnia non ſolum in exordio creavit condendo, ſed etiam *ſemper creat* præparando & reparando: *bona*, quia omnia à Deo creata valdè bona: creata & ſuis conſpectibus oblata *ſanctificat*, ut quæ erant ſimplex creatura, fiant Sacramenta: *vivificat*, ut ſint myſteria vitæ: *Benedicit*, quia omni benedictione cœleſti & gratiâ accumulat. *Præſtat nobis*, per eundem ſecum ſanctificaneem, qui de corpore ſuo & ſanguine ſuo nobis tam ſalubrem dedit refectionem.

The old Interpreters of the Canon made other work of it, and ſuppoſed that the *Creatures offered* to God, *remained Creatures* ſtill; for thus the forecited *Remigius* (z) comments upon them. *God the Father not only in the beginning*, created all theſe things *by Chriſt*, *but alſo always creates them, by preparing and repairing them.* Good, *becauſe all things created by Good are very good. He* ſanctifies *thoſe things ſo created and offered in his ſight, when the things that were a ſimple Creature, are made Sacraments: he* quickens them, *ſo that they become Myſteries of Life: He* bleſſes them, *becauſe he heaps all Celeſtial Benediction and Grace on them. He* beſtows them on us, *by the ſame Chriſt ſanctifying them with him, who has given to us ſo wholſom a repaſt from his Body and Blood.*

What can be alſo more plain than the words of the next Prayer I mentioned, *That what we have taken with our Mouth, may of a Temporal Gift be made an Eternal Remedy?* Did ever any one call Chriſt a *Temporal Gift*, in diſtinction from an *Eternal Remedy?* Is it not certain that the *Oblata*, the things offered, are the *Temporal Gift*, which by our due receiving them, become eternally beneficial to us?

The laſt Prayer alſo, which beg, That *the Body and Blood of Chriſt may cleave to their Bowels or Entrals*, cannot be interpreted of his *proper* and *natural Body*; ſince, as the Romaniſts confeſs, this Body can neither touch us, nor be touched by us, as it exiſts in the Sacrament, much leſs can *cleave or ſtick* to our Bodies. But the *repreſentative* Body of Chriſt may; and he that made this Petition firſt, ſeems to tell us his *own Senſe*, (tho' no very wiſe one) that he would not have this Holy Food to paſs through him, as other Meats did (and which many

many of the Ancients thought this alſo did) but might remain and be conſumed (as S. *Chryſoſtom*'s phraſe is) with the Subſtance of his Body.

Thus I think I have demonſtrated ſufficiently the firſt thing I aſſerted at the beginning of this Chapter, *That the old Prayers in the Canon of the Maſs, concerning the Sacrament, agree not with the preſent Faith of the Roman Church.*

I proceed now to ſhew the other thing, That *their New Prayers and Devotions to the Sacrament, have no countenance from the Ancient Church.*

I told the Reader before of their New Feſtival, which the *Miſſal* calls the *Feaſt and Solemnity of the Body of Chriſt.* They have ſuited all things anſwerably to it; *New Prayers, New Hymns*; and their allowed *Books of Devotion*, have an *Office of the Bleſſed Sacrament*, for one day of the Week, and a *New Litany*, &c. Which I ſhall give now ſome account of, and tho' all of them are not direct Prayers to it, yet they are ſuch ſtrains concerning it, and in ſuch a new Stile, as has no old Example.

Thus tranſlated in the Manual of Godly Prayers.

O God, which under the Admirable Sacrament, haſt left unto us the Memory of thy Paſſion: grant, we beſeech thee, that we may ſo worſhip the Sacred Myſteries of thy Body and Blood, that continually we may feel in us the fruit of thy Redemption.

Who liveſt, &c.

Miſſal. Rom. in Solenn. corporis Chriſti.

Oratio.

Deus qui nobis ſub Sacramento mirabili paſſionis tuæ memoriam reliquiſti: tribue, quæſumus, ita nos corporis & ſanguinis tui ſacra Myſteria venerari, ut redemptionis tuæ fructum in nobis jugiter ſentiamus. Qui vivis, &c.

I believe the *Ancient Church* never thus prayed, that by the *worſhip of the Sacred Myſteries, they might feel the Fruit of Chriſt's Redemption*; but that *they might ſo receive the Sacred Myſteries*, &c. for they laid the ſtreſs upon *worthy receiving*, as this Church do's upon *worſhipping*.

In

In an *Office of the Venerable Sacrament*, printed at *Colen*, 1591. they are ſtill more particular.

Ibid. p. 72. ad completor.
Deus qui glorioſum corporis & ſanguinis tui myſterium nobiſcum manere voluiſti: præſta, quæſumus, ita nos corporalem præſentiam tuam venerari in terris, ut ejus viſione gaudere mereamur in cœlis. Qui vivis, &c.

O God, who wouldſt have the glorious Myſtery of thy Body and Blood to remain with us; grant, we pray thee, that we may ſo worſhip thy corporal Preſence on Earth, that we may be worthy to enjoy the Viſion of it in Heaven. Who liveſt, &c.

Ibid. p. 44. ad primam.
Deus qui in paſſionis tuæ memoriam panem & vinum in corpus & ſanguinem tuum mirabiliter tranſmutaſti; concede propitius, ut qui in venerabili Sacramento tuam præſentiam corporalem credimus, ad contemplandam ſpeciem tuæ celſitudinis perducamur. Qui vivis, &c.

Again thus;
O God, who in memory of thy Paſſion didſt wonderfully change Bread and Wine into thy Body and Blood; mercifully grant, that we who believe thy Corporal Preſence in the Venerable Sacrament, may be brought to the beholding of the appearance of thy Highneſs.
Who liveſt, &c.

Rithmus S. Thomæ ad Sacram Euchariſtiam; *Or a Rithm of* Tho. Aquinas *to the Holy Euchariſt.*

In Miſſal. Rom. ad finem Orat. poſt Miſſam.
Adoro te devotè latens Deitas,
Quæ ſub his figuris vere latitas.
Tibi ſe cor meum totum ſubjicit,
Quia te contemplans totum deficit.
Viſus, tactus, guſtus in te fallitur,
Sed auditu ſolo tutò creditur.
Credo quicquid dixit Dei Filius.
Nil hoc verbo veritatis verius.
In cruce latebat ſola Deitas,
At hic latet ſimul & humanitas:
Ambo tamen credens atque confitens,
Peto quod petivit Latro penitens.
Plagas, ſicut Thomas, non intueor,
Deum tamen meum te confiteor.
Fac me tibi ſemper magis credere,
In te ſpem habere, te diligere.
O Memoriale Mortis Domini,
Panis vivus, vitam præſtans homini;

I devoutly adore thee, *O latent Deity*,
Who under theſe Figures truly lieſt hid.
My Heart ſubmits it ſelf wholly to thee, (me.
For when it contemplates thee, it wholly fails
Sight, taſt, and touch, is deceived in thee,
Hearing alone a Man may ſafely truſt.
Whatſoe'er the Son of God ſaid, I believe.
Nothing is truer than this Word of Truth.
The Deity only on the Croſs was hid,
Here the Humanity alſo is conceal'd:
But both believing and confeſſing both,
I ask what the Repenting Thief deſir'd.
I do not ſee, as *Thomas* did, thy Wounds,
Yet I acknowledg thee to be my God.
O make me ſtill more to believe in thee,
On thee to place my Hope, and thee to love.
O thou Memorial of my dying Lord,
Thou living Bread, and giving Life to Men,

Præſta

Grant

Præſta meæ menti de te vivere,
Et te illi ſemper dulcè ſapere, *&c.*

Grant that my Soul on thee may ever live,
And thou to it mayſt always ſweetly taſt, *&c.*

Another Sequence of Tho. Aquinas, which begins, *Lauda Sion Salvatorem.*

In Miſſal. Rom. in feſto Corp. Chriſti.

Docti Sacris inſtitutis,
Panem vinum in ſalutis
Conſecramus hoſtiam.

Being taught by holy Leſſons, we conſecrate Bread and Wine for a ſaving Hoſt.

Dogma datur Chriſtianis,
Quod in carnem tranſit panis
Et vinum in ſanguinem.

It's a Maxim to Chriſtians, that Bread is changed into Fleſh, and Wine into Blood.

Quod non capis, quod non vides,
Animoſa firmat fides
Præter rerum ordinem.

What thou doſt not comprehend, or ſee, a ſtrong Faith confirms it, beſides the order of Nature.

Sub diverſis ſpeciebus,
Signis tantum & non rebus
Latent res eximiæ.

Precious Things lie hid under different Species, which are Signs only, not Things.

Caro cibus, ſanguis potus;
Manet tamen Chriſtus totus
Sub utràq; ſpecie.

The Fleſh is Meat, and the Blood Drink, yet Chriſt remains whole under each Kind.

A ſumente non conciſus,
Non confractus, non diviſus,
Integer accipitur.

Uncut, unbroken, undivided, he is received whole by him that takes him.

Sumit unus, ſumunt mille,
Quantum iſti, tantum ille;
Nec ſumptus conſumitur.

When a thouſand take him, one takes as much as they; nor is he conſumed in taking.

Sumunt boni, ſumunt mali;
Sorte tamen inæquali
Vitæ vel interitus.

The Good and Bad both take him, but their Lot is unequal in Life and Death.

Mors eſt malis, vita bonis;
Vide paris ſumptionis
Quàm ſit diſpar exitus.

He is Death to the Bad, and Life to the Good; behold an unlike end of a like taking.

Fracto demum Sacramento,
Ne vacilles, ſed memento,
Tantum eſſe ſub fragmento,
Quantum toto tegitur.
Nulla rei fit ſciſſura,
Signi tantum fit fractura;
Qua nec ſtatus, nec ſtatura
Signati minuitur, *&c.*

When the Sacrament is broken,
Be not ſtagger'd, but remember,
There is as much in a Particle
As the whole covers.
Here is no diviſion of the thing,
Only a breaking of the Sign;
Whereby neither the State nor Stature of the thing ſignified is diminiſhed, *&c.*

Another Hymn of the ſame Author, which begins, *Pange lingua glorioſi.*

In Breviar. Rom. in feſto Corp. Chriſti.

In ſupremæ noctè cœnæ
Recumbens cum fratribus,
Obſervata lege plenè
Cibis in legalibus;
Cibum turbæ duodenæ
Se dat ſuis manibus.
Verbum caro, panem verum
Verbo carnem efficit,
Fit; ſanguis Chriſti merum,
Et ſi ſenſus deficit
Ad firmandum cor ſincerum
Sola fides ſufficit.

Tantum ergo Sacramentum
Veneremur cernui:
Et antiquum documentum
Novo cedat ritui:
Præſtet fides ſupplementum
Senſuum defectui, *&c.*

Thus tranſlated in the Manual of Godly Prayers.

At his laſt Supper made by Night,
He with his Brethren takes his Seat,
And having kept the Ancient rite
Uſing the Laws preſcribed Meat;
His twelve Diſciples doth invite,
From his own Hands himſelf to eat.
The Word made Fleſh, to words imparts
Such ſtrength, that Bread his Fleſh is made,
He Wine into his Blood converts;
And if our Senſe here fail and fade,
To ſatisfy Religious Hearts,
Faith only can the Truth perſwade.

Then to this Sacrament ſo high,
Low rev'rence let us now direct,
Old Rites muſt yield in dignity
To this, with ſuch great Graces deckt:
And Faith will all thoſe Wants ſupply,
Wherein the Senſes feel defect, *&c.*

In another Hymn of Th. Aquinas, *which begins,* Verbum ſupernum prodiens, *they pray thus to the Sacrament.*

In Breviar. Rom. in Feſto Corp. Chriſti.

O ſalutaris Hoſtia,
Quæ Cœli pandis oſtium:
Bella premunt hoſtilia,
Da robur, fer auxilium.

O ſaving Hoſt, that openeſt Heaven's Door,
Th' Arms of our Foes, do us encloſe:
Thy ſtrength we need; O help with ſpeed,
We humbly thee implore.

There was publiſhed at *Paris*, with the approbration of three *Doctors of the Faculty* there, *An.* 1669. a little Book in French, called, *Practique pour Adorer le tres Saint Sacrament de l' Autel*: Or, *A Form for the Adoration of the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Altar.* Which begins thus:

Praiſed and adored be the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Altar.

And then adds;

Whoſoever ſhall ſay theſe Holy Words, [*Praiſed be the moſt Holy Sacrament of the Altar*] ſhall gain an hundred days of

of Indulgences; and he that do's reverence, hearing them repeated, as much. He that, being confeſſed and communicated, ſhall ſay the above-ſaid words, ſhall gain a Plenary Indulgence; and the firſt five times that he ſhall ſay them, after his having been Confeſſed and Communicated, he ſhall deliver five of his Friends-ſouls, whom he pleaſes, out of Purgatory.

Then follows the *Form for honouring the Holy Sacrament*, conſiſting of two Prayers, as follows, (which I ſhall ſet down in Latin and Engliſh, becauſe I find them in the Hours of *Sarum*, Fol. 66. and in the S. *Litanie variæ*, *p.* 44. printed at *Colen*, 1643. The firſt of them has this Rubrick before it in the *Hours of Salisbury*. *Our Holy Father the Pope*, John xxii. *hath granted to all them that devoutly ſay this Prayer after the Elevation of our Lord Jeſu Chriſt, three thouſand days of Pardon for deadly Sins*).

Anima Chriſti ſanctifica me.	Soul of Chriſt, ſanctify me.
Corpus Chriſti ſalva me.	Body of Chriſt, ſave me.
Sanguis Chriſti inebria me.	Blood of Chriſt, inebriate me.
Aqua lateris Chriſti lava me.	Water of Chriſt's Side, waſh me.
(Hor. Sar. *Splendor vultus Chriſti illumina me.*)	
Paſſio Chriſti conforta me.	Paſſion of Chriſt, comfort me.
(H.Sar.*Sudor vultus Chriſti virtuoſiſſime ſana me.*)	
O bone Jeſu exaudi me.	O good Jeſus hear me.
Intra vulnera tua abſconde me.	Within thy Wounds hide me.
Ne permittas me ſeparari à te.	Suffer me not to be ſeparated from thee.
Ab hoſte maligno defende me.	From the malicious Enemy defend me.
In hora mortis meæ voca me,	In the Hour of my Death call me,
Et jube me venire ad te;	And command me to come to thee,
Ut cum ſanctis tuis laudem te	That with thy Saints I may praiſe thee,
In ſæcula ſæculorum. Amen.	For evermore. *Amen.*

At the Elevation of the Maſs.

Hor. ſec. uſ. Sar. Ibid.	*Thus tranſlated in the Manual of Godly Prayers.*
Ave verum corpus natum	All hail true Body, born of
De Maria Virgine;	the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*;
Vere paſſum, immolatum	Truly ſuffered and offered upon the
In cruce pro homine:	Croſs for Mankind:
Cujus latus perforatum	Whoſe Side, pierced with a Spear,
Unda fluxit ſanguine.	yielded Water and Blood.
Eſto nobis præguſtatum	Vouchſafe to be received of us
Mortis in examine.	in the Hour of Death.
O Clemens, O pie,	O good, O Jeſu, Son of the Bleſſed
O dulcis Fili Mariæ.	Virgin, have mercy on me.

After this, the *French Form* adds what follows.

"These two good Prayers were found in the Sepulchre of "our Lord Jesus Christ in *Jerusalem*; and whosoever carries "them about him with Devotion, and in Honour of our "Lord Jesus Christ, shall be delivered from the Devil, and "from suddain Death, and shall not die of an ill Death. He "shall be preserved from Pestilence, and all infectious Dis-"eases. No Sorcerer, nor Sorcery, shall be able to hurt "him or her, that has these two good Prayers about them. "The Fire from Heaven shall not fall upon the House where "these Prayers are rehearsed with devotion. A Woman "with Child, saying them devoutly, shall be brought to "Bed, without any danger of her own, or her Child's "Death. Lightnings and Thunders shall not fall upon the "Houses where these Prayers are rehearsed with Devotion. "Such a one shall not die without Confession, and God will "give him Grace to repent of his Sins.

Now I will add a Specimen of Litanies of the Sacrament.

Litaniæ de Sacramento:

S. Litaniæ variæ p. 30.

——— Panis vivus qui de Cœlo descendisti	Miserere nobis.
Deus absconditus & Salvator	
Frumentum Electorum	
Vinum germinans Virgines	
Panis pinguis & deliciæ Regum	
Juge Sacrificium	
Oblatio munda	
Agnus absq; macula	
Mensa ptirissima	
Angelorum Esca	
Manna absconditum	
Memoria mirabilium Dei	
Panis Supersubstantialis	
Verbum caro factum habitans in nobis	
Hostia Sancta	
Calix Benedictionis	

Mysterium

The Litany of the Sacrament in the Manual aforesaid.

——— Living Bread that didst descend from Heaven	Have mercy on us.
God hidden, and my Saviour	
Bread-Corn of the Elect	
Wine budding forth Virgins	
Fat Bread, and the delight of Kings	
Continual Sacrifice	
Pure Oblation	
Lamb without spot	
(Manual adds) *Table of Proposition*	
Most pure Table	
Food of Angels	
Hidden Manna	
Memorial of God's wonderful Works	
Supersubstantial Bread	
Word made Flesh and dwelling in us	
Holy Host	
Chalice of Benediction	

Mystery

Myſterium fidei		Myſtery of Faith	
Præcelſum & venerabile Sacramentum		Moſt high and venerable Sacrament	
Sacrificium omnium Sanctiſſimum		Sacrifice of all other moſt Holy	
Vere propitiatorium pro vivis & defunctis		Truly propitiatory for the Quick and Dead	
Cœleſte Antidotum, quo à peccatis præſervamur		Heavenly Antidote, whereby we are preſerved from Sin	
Stupendum ſupra omnia miraculum		Miracle above all other aſtoniſhing	
Sacratiſſima Dominicæ paſſionis commemoratio		Moſt ſacred Commemoration of our Lord's Death	
Donum tranſcendens omnem plenitudinem	Miſerere nobis.	Gift ſurpaſſing all Fulneſs	Have mercy on us.
Memoriale præcipuum divini amoris		Chief Memorial of Divine Love	
Divinæ affluentia largitatis		Abundance of Divine Bounty	
Sacroſanctum & auguſtiſſimum myſterium		Holy and moſt Majeſtical Myſtery	
Pharmacum immortalitatis		Medicine of Immortality	
Tremendum ac vivificum Sacramentum		Dreadful and Life-giving Sacrament	
Panis omnipotentia verbi caro factus		Bread by the Word's Omnipotence made Fleſh	
Incruentum Sacrificium		Unbloody Sacrifice	
Cibus & conviva		Meat and Gueſt (*Manual omits*)	
Dulciſſimum convivium, cui aſſiſtunt Angeli miniſtrantes		Moſt ſweet Banquet, whereat the Miniſtring Angels attend	
Sacramentum Pietatis		Sacrament of Piety	
Vinculum Charitatis		Bond of Charity	
Offerens & Oblatio		Offerer and Oblation	
Spiritualis dulcedo in proprio fonte deguſtata		Spiritual ſweetneſs taſted in its proper Fountain	
Refectio animarum Sanctarum		Refection of Holy Souls	
Viaticum in Domino morientium		Viaticum of thoſe who die in our Lord	
Pignus futuræ gloriæ, &c.		Pledge of future Glory, *&c.*	

This is enough to ſhow into what ſtrains of Devotion the preſent *Roman Church* now runs, ſince Tranſubſtantiation is an Article of its Faith. I deny not that theſe Prayers are very natural if that Doctrine were true; and I would fain have a good Reaſon aſſigned, why, if this Doctrine was believed of old, this was not the way of the *Primitive Devotion:* If they affirm that it was, it lies upon them to produce the evidence. But then let me tell them before-hand, that we will not be ſhamm'd off with *a Rhetorical Proſopopœia* of an Author, under the name of S. *Denis the Areopagite* (which has been the only thing I have ſeen alledged, and as often anſwered) whoſe Authority neither cannot be conſiderable to us, who remember that he was firſt produced and ſhown to the World by Hereticks, and rejected by the Orthodox.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

The Sixteenth Difference.

Our Ancient Roman-Saxon Church differed from the preſent Roman Church, in the Article of Tranſubſtantiation and Corporal Preſence.

THis is the Laſt Difference I ſhall mention, tho' not the leaſt; but a very material confirmation of what I have been all along proving, That there is no conſent of the Ancient Church with the preſent Roman Church, in their Faith and Opinions about the Euchariſt; when we ſhall find, that even our own *Old Engliſh Church*, that had received moſt of its Inſtructions in Chriſtianity from the Roman, and in many other things agreed with what it now profeſſes, yet in this widely differ'd from it.

This plainly argues one of theſe two things, either that the *then Roman Church*, had not the Opinions of the preſent Church in theſe Matters and ſo did not propagate them to us; (which cannot be ſaid, when we remember the buſy Diſputes about theſe Matters in the *9th* Century, tho' they were not yet come to a determination); or elſe, that when the Roman Church warped, and generally eſpouſed a New Doctrine which the Ancient Fathers were ſtrangers to, we ſtill kept our Ground, and did not ſuffer our ſelves to be perverted, but held to the Ancient Belief.

This is the Truth of our Caſe, as appears by a noble Remain of an *Eaſter Sermon* (about 700 Years old) in the Saxon Tongue, among other Catholick Homilies that were to be read yearly in the Church, It was produced in the laſt Age in the Saxon with a Tranſlation in our Engliſh Tongue, (printed by *John Day*) it was ſince put, with the ſame Tranſlation, by Mr. *Fox* into his Martyrology *, and has been ſet forth with a Latin Tranſlation by the Learned *Abr. Wheloc*k, in his *Saxon Edition* of *Bede's* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, p. 462. printed

* *Vol. 2. p. 380. laſt Edition.*

printed at *Cambridg* 1644. out of which I ſhall tranſcribe as much as will ſerve to prove our Aſſertion, ſoftning the harſhneſs of the Phraſes of the laſt Age, and expreſſing the ſenſe in words more eaſily underſtood.

The Eaſter Sermon begins thus:

"MEN Beloved, you have been often diſcourſed to, "concerning our Saviour's Reſurrection, how he, after "his Paſſion on this Day, roſe powerfully from the Dead. "Now we ſhall, by God's Grace explain ſomething to you "about the Holy Euchariſt, which this day we are bound to "frequent, and inſtruct your underſtanding about this My"ſtery, both according to the Old and New Teſtament, that "no doubting may diſturb you concerning this Life-giving "Banquet.———

The Sermon goes on with an account of the Jewiſh Paſſover, and the Application of thoſe things to the Euchariſt, which I omit;

"———Chriſt, before his ſuffering, conſecrated Bread, P. 469.
"and diſtributed it to his Diſciples, ſaying thus, *Eat this "Bread, it is my Body, and do this in remembrance of me:* Alſo "he Conſecrated Wine in a Cup, and ſaid, *Drink ye all of "this, This is my Blood which is ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of "Sins.* The Apoſtles did, as Chriſt commanded, they con"ſecrated Bread and Wine for the Euchariſt. And to his "memory alſo afterward every one of their Succeſſors, and "all Chriſt's Prieſts, According to Chriſt's Command, by the "Apoſtolical Benediction, did conſecrate Bread and Wine "in his Name. Now Men have often diſputed, and do it P. 470.
"ſtill, How that Bread which is prepared of Corn, and is ba"ked by the heat of Fire, can be changed into Chriſt's Body; "and how that Wine which is preſſed out of many Grapes, "by any bleſſing of it, can be changed into our Lord's Blood? "Now to ſuch Men, I anſwer, that ſome things are ſpoken "of Chriſt *by ſignification*, ſome others by a *known thing:* It "is a true thing, and known, that Chriſt was born of a Vir"gin, and voluntarily ſuffered Death, and was buried, and this

"this Day rose from the Dead. He is called *Bread*, and a "*Lamb*, and *a Lion*, and otherwise, by *signification*. He is "called *Bread*, because he is our Life, and the Life of Angels. "He is called a *Lamb*, for his Innocency. A *Lion*, for his "Strength, whereby he overcame the strong Devil. Yet "notwithstanding, according to true Nature, Christ is nei- "ther *Bread*, nor a *Lamb*, nor a *Lion*. Wherefore then is "that Holy Eucharist called *Christ's Body*, or *his Blood*, if it "be not truly what it is called? Truly the Bread and Wine, "which are consecrated by the Mass of the Priests, show one "thing outwardly to Mens Senses, and another thing they de- "clare inwardly to believing Minds. Outwardly, Bread and "Wine are seen both in appearance, and in taste; yet they "are truly after Consecration Christ's Body and Blood, "by *a Spiritual Sacrament*. An Heathen Child is Baptized, "yet he altereth not his outward shape, though he be chan- "ged within. He is brought to the Font full of Sin through "*Adam's* Disobedience, but he is washed from all his Sins in- "wardly, tho' he has not changed his outward Shape. So al- "so that Holy Font-Water, which is called the Well-spring "of Life, is like in Nature (*in specie*) to other Waters, and "is subject to corruption; but the Power of the Holy Ghost, "by the Priest's Blessing, comes upon that corruptible Wa- "ter; and after that, it can wash both Body and Soul from
P. 471. "all Sins, by spiritual Power. We see now in this one Crea- "ture two things: that, whereby, according to true Nature, "it is corruptible Water, and that whereby, according to "the Spiritual Mystery, it has a saving Power. So also, if "we look upon that Holy Eucharist according to a corporeal "Sense, then we see that it is a Creature corruptible and "changeable; but if we own a spiritual Power there, then "we understand that Life is in it, and that it confers Im- "mortality on those that taste it by Faith. There is a great "difference betwixt the invisible Vertue (and Power) of this "Holy Eucharist, and the visible appearance of its proper "Nature. By its Nature it is corruptible Bread, and corrup- "tible Wine; and by the Virtue of the Divine Word, it "is *truly* the Body and Blood of Christ; yet not *corporally* so, "but *spiritually*. There is much differencce betwixt that Bo- "dy which Christ suffer'd in, and that Body which is con-

secrated

"ſecrated for the Euchariſt. The Body that Chriſt ſuffer'd "in, was Born of the Fleſh of *Mary*, with Blood and Bones, "with Skin and Nerves; animated by a rational Spirit in hu- "mane Members: but his *Spiritual Body*, which we call the "Euchariſt, is collected from many grains of Corn, without "Blood and Bone, without Member or Soul: wherefore "there is nothing in it to be underſtood *Corporeally*, but all "is to be underſtood *Spiritually*. Whatſoever is in that Eu- "chariſt which reſtores Life to us, this is from Spiritual Vir- "tue, and from inviſible Operation. Therefore that Holy "Euchariſt is called a Sacrament, becauſe one thing is there "ſeen, and another thing underſtood: that which is there ſeen "has a *bodily Nature*, that which we underſtand in it has *a* "*ſpiritual Virtue*. The Body of Chriſt, that ſuffered Death, P. 472.
"and roſe from the Dead, henceforth dies no more, but is "eternal and impaſſible. That Euchariſt is Temporary, not "Eternal; it is corruptible, and capable of diviſion into mi- "nute Parts; it is chewed with the Teeth, and ſent into the "draught: yet it will be true, that *according to ſpiritual Vir-* "*tue*, it is whole in every part: Many receive that Holy Bo- "dy, yet according to the ſpiritual Myſtery, it will be whole "in every part. Tho' ſome receive a leſſer part of it, yet "there will not be more virtue in the greater part than in the "leſſer, becauſe it will be whole in all Men according to the "inviſible virtue. This Sacrament is a *Pledg*, and a *Type*; the "Body of Chriſt is *the Truth*: We keep this Pledg Sacra- "mentally, till we come to the Truth it ſelf; and then is "the Pledg at an end. It is indeed, as we ſaid before, Chriſt's "Body and his Blood, but not *Corporally*, but *Spiritually*. Do "not diſpute, how this can be effected, but believe it firmly, "that ſo it is.

Here follow ſome idle Viſions, which that credulous Age were fond of, but are nothing to the purpoſe, and therefore I omit them.

"——— *Paul* the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the old Iſraelites P. 473.
"writing thus in his Epiſtle to the Faithful. *All our Fore-fa-* "*thers were baptized in the Cloud and in the Sea; and all ate the* "*ſame ſpiritual Meat, and all drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink*,

"*for they drank of that ſpiritual Rock, and that Rock was* "*Chriſt.* That Rock, from whence the Water then flowed, "was not Chriſt in a *Corporal Senſe*, but it ſignified Chriſt, "who declared thus to the Faithful, *Whoſoever thirſteth, let him* "*come to me and drink, and from his belly ſhall flow living Wa-* "*ter. This he ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt, which they that Believed* "*on him, ſhould receive.* The Apoſtle *Paul* ſaid, that the Peo- "ple of *Iſrael ate the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and drank the ſame Spi-* "*ritual Drink*, becauſe the heavenly Food that fed them for "forty Years, and that Water that flowed from the Rock, "*ſignified* Chriſt's Body and Blood, which are now dayly of- "fered in the Church of God. It was the ſame which we "offer to day, not *corporally*, but *ſpiritually*. We told you "before, that Chriſt conſecrated Bread and Wine for the "Euchariſt before his Paſſion, and ſaid, This is my Body, and "my Blood: he had not yet ſuffered, and yet he changed, "by his inviſible Power, that Bread into his Body, and that "Wine into his Blood; as he did before in the Wilderneſs, "before he was born Man, when he turned the heavenly Food "into his Fleſh, and that Water flowing from the Rock into his
P. 474. "Blood. Many Perſons ate of the Heavenly Food in the Deſart, "and drank of the Spiritual Drink, and yet, as Chriſt ſaid, are "dead. Chriſt meant not that Death which no Man can avoid, "but he underſtood eternal Death, which ſeveral of that Peo- "ple, for their Unbelief, had deſerved. *Moſes* and *Aaron*, and "ſeveral others of the People that pleaſed God, ate that hea- "venly Bread, and did not die that everlaſting Death, tho' "they died the common Death. They ſaw that the heavenly "Food was viſible and Corruptible; but they underſtood "that viſible thing *ſpiritually*, and they taſted *it ſpiritually*. "Jeſus ſaid, *Whoſo eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood,* "*hath Eternal Life:* He did not command them to eat that "Body which he had aſſumed, nor to drink that Blood which "he ſhed for us; but by that Speech, he meant the Holy Eu- "chariſt, which is *Spiritually* his Body, and his Blood; and who- "ſoever taſteth this, with a believing Heart, ſhall have that "Eternal Life. Under the old Law, the Faithful offered di- "vers Sacrifices to God, which had a future ſignification "of the Body of Chriſt, which he hath offered in Sacrifice "to his heavenly Father for our Sins. This Euchariſt which

"is

"is now conſecrated at God's Altar, is a Commemoration of "the Body of Chriſt which he offered for us, and of his "Blood which he ſhed for us: As he himſelf commanded, "*Do this in remembrance of me.* Chriſt once ſuffered by him- "ſelf; but yet his Paſſion by the Sacrament of this Holy Eu- "chariſt, is daily renewed at the Holy Maſs. Wherefore "the Holy Maſs is profitable very much both for the Living, "and alſo for the Dead, as it hath been often declared, &c.

The reſt of the Sermon being of a moral and allegorical Nature, I omit.

Beſides this Sermon in Publick, we have alſo two other Remains of *Elfrike* the Abbot in the Saxon Tongue *, which ſpeak the very ſame Senſe, and deſerve to be inſerted as far as they concern this Argument of the Euchariſt, and the change made in it.

* *Publiſhed at the end of the forſaid Sermon, printed by* John Day. *Alſo in the Notes on* Bede's *Eccl. Hiſt.* p. 332, 333, 334.

The firſt is *an Epiſtle to* Wulffine *Biſhop of Shyrburn*, in which is this Paſſage.

"——— The Euchariſt is not the Body of Chriſt *corpo-* "*rally*, but *ſpiritually*: not the Body in which he ſuffered, "but that Body when he conſecrated Bread and Wine for the "Euchariſt, the night before his Paſſion, and ſaid of the "Bread he Bleſſed, *This is my Body*; and again of the Wine "he bleſſed, *This is my Blood, which is ſhed for many for the* "*Remiſſion of Sins.* Now then underſtand, that the Lord, "who was able to change that Bread before his Paſſion into "his Body, and that Wine into his Blood, *Spiritually*; that "the ſame (*Lord*) by the Hands of the Prieſts, daily conſe- "crates Bread and Wine for his Spiritual Body, and for his "Spiritual Blood.

The ſecond, an *Epiſtle of Elfricke to Wulfſtane Arch-Biſhop of York*, in which, among other things (againſt too long reſerving the Euchariſt,) he ſays thus:

Vid. p. 334. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sax. Lat. *Bed.*

"Chriſt himſelf conſecrated the Euchariſt before his Paſ-
"ſion; he bleſſed Bread, and brake it, ſaying thus to his
"Apoſtles, *Eat this Bread, it is my Body:* and again he bleſſed
"the Cup, filled with Wine, and ſpake thus to them, *Drink*
"*ye all of this, it is my Blood of the New Teſtament, which is*
"*ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of Sins.* Our Lord, who con-
"ſecrated the Euchariſt before his Paſſion, and ſaid; that
"Bread was his Body, and Wine truly his Blood, he alſo
"daily conſecrates, by the Prieſts hands, Bread for his Body,
"and Wine for his Blood, in a Spiritual Myſtery, as we read
"in Books. [Yet notwithſtanding that Lively Bread is not
"the ſame Body in which Chriſt ſuffered, nor that Holy
"Wine the Blood of our Saviour (which was ſhed for us)
"in bodily thing *(or ſence, in re corporali)* but in a Spiritual
"ſence *(in ratione Spirituali.)* That Bread indeed was his
"Body, and alſo that Wine his Blood, juſt as that heavenly
"Bread which we call Manna (which fed God's People forty
"Years) *viz. was his Body*, and that clear Water was his
"Blood that then flowed from the Rock in the Wilderneſs.]
"As *Paul* writes in his Epiſtle, They all ate the ſame ſpiri-
"tual Meat and drank the ſame ſpiritual Drink, *&c.* The
"Apoſtle that ſays, what you have heard, They all ate *&c.*
"he do's not ſay, *corporally*, but ſpiritually. Chriſt was not
"as yet born, nor his Blood ſhed: then it was the People of
"*Iſrael* did eat that Spiritual Meat, and drank of that Rock;
"neither was that Rock Chriſt Corporeally tho' he ſpake ſo.
"The Sacraments of the Old Law were the ſame, and did
"ſpiritually ſignify that Sacrament (or Euchariſt) of our
"Saviour's Body, which we now conſecrate.

This Laſt Epiſtle *Elfricke* wrote firſt in the Latin Tongue to *Wulfſtane*, containing, tho' not word for word, yet the whole Sence of the Engliſh Epiſtle; and that Paragraph of it which I have incloſed between two Brackets, was look'd upon as ſo diſagreeable to the preſent Faith of the Roman Church,

Church, that ſome had raſed them out of the *Worceſter* Book; but the ſame Latin Epiſtle being found in *Exeter* Church, it was reſtored.

I was once about to have added ſome Citations here out of *Bertram*'s Book, *(de corpore & ſanguine Domini)* out of which many paſſages in the Saxon Sermon foregoing, were taken. But they are ſo many, that I muſt have tranſcribed, and the Book it ſelf is ſmall, and ſo well worth the reading, eſpecially with the late Tranſlation of it into Engliſh, and a Learned Hiſtorical Diſſertation before it, giving a large account of the Difference betwixt his Opinion, and that of Tranſubſtantiation (printed *An* 1686.) that I ſhall rather refer the Reader to it, where he may abundantly ſatisfy himſelf.

Inſtead of it, I will only add one Teſtimony more out of *Rabanus* Arch-biſhop of *Mentz*, in an Epiſtle to *Heribaldus* [a]. Which we are beholden to the Learned *Baluzius* for giving it us entire, (*in Appendice ad Reginonem*, p. 516.) a Paſſage having been raſed out of the *Manuſcript*, out of which it was firſt publiſhed. Thus he ſays;

[a] Epiſt. ad Heribald. c. 33. de Euchariſt.

As for the Queſtion you put, Whether the Euchariſt, after it is conſumed and ſent into the Draught as other Meats are, do's return again into its former Nature, which it had before it was conſecrated on the Altar; This Queſtion is ſuperfluous, when our Saviour himſelf has ſaid in the Goſpel, *Every thing that entreth into the Mouth, goeth into the Belly, and is caſt out into the Draught.* The Sacrament of the Body and Blood, is made up of things Viſible and Corporeal, but effects the Inviſible Sanctification both of Body and Soul. And what reaſon is there, that what is digeſted in the Stomach,

Quod autem interrogaſtis, utrum Euchariſtia poſtquam conſumitur & in ſeceſſum emittitur, more aliorum ciborum, iterum redeat in naturam priſtinam quam habuerat, antequam in Altari conſecraretur, ſuperflua eſt hujuſmodi Quæſtio, cùm ipſe Salvator dixerit in Evangelio, *Omne quod intrat in os, in ventrem vadit, & in ſeceſſum emittitur.* Sacramentum Corporis & Sanguinis ex rebus viſibilibus & corporalibus conficitur, ſed inviſibilem tàm corporis quàm animæ effici ſanctificationem. Quæ eſt enim ratio, ut hoc quod ſtomacho digeritur, & in ſeceſſum emittitur, iterum in ſtatum priſtinum redeat, cum nullus hoc unquam fieri aſſeruerit? Nam quidam nuper de ipſo Sacramento corporis & ſanguinis Domini non rectè ſentientes, dixerunt, hoc ipſum corpus & ſanguinem Domini quod de Maria Virgine natum eſt, & in quo ipſe Dominus paſſus eſt in Cruce, & reſurrexit de ſepulchro, [*Idem eſt quod ſumitur de altari*] cui errori quantum potuimus, ad *Egilonem Abbatem* ſcripſimus, de corpore ipſo quid verè credendum ſit, aperuimus.

and

and ſent into the Draught, ſhou'd return into its priſtine State, ſeeing none has ever aſſerted that this was done? Some indeed of late, not thinking rightly of the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood have ſaid *(which are the very words of* Paſchaſius, *whom he oppoſes)* that the very Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and in which our Lord ſuffered on the Croſs, and roſe again out of the Grave, [*is the ſame that is taken from the Altar*]; which Error we having oppoſed as we were able, writing to the Abbot *Egilo*, and declared what ought truly to be believed concerning the Body it ſelf.

That which he calls here an *Error*, is an *Article* now of the *Romiſh Faith*, which ſome *Zealous Monk* meeting withal, and not enduring it ſhould be condemned as an Error, that the ſame Body which was born of the Virgin, *&c.* is the ſame that we receive at the Altar, ſcraped out thoſe words which I have incloſed between the Brackets; and we may ſecurely truſt our Adverſaries in this Matter, who have skill enough to know what Aſſertions make for them, and what againſt them.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

The CONCLUSION.

That the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation has given a new occaſion to the Enemies of Chriſtian Religion to blaſpheme. It is ſo great a ſtumbling-block to the Jews, that their Converſion is hopeleſs, whilſt this is believed by them to be the Common Faith of Chriſtians. That tho' the Church of Rome *will not hearken to us, yet they may be provoked to emulation by the Jews themſelves, who have given a better account of Chriſt's Words of Inſtitution, and more agreeable to the Fathers, than this Church has, and raiſed unanſwerable Objections againſt its Doctrine.*

HAving conſidered, in the foregoing Chapters, the Senſe of the Ancient Church about Matters relating to the Euchariſt, and Tranſubſtantiation, from their own Writings; and found that their Aſſertions are inconſiſtent with the Beliçf of the preſent Roman Church; and that their Practices are not to be reconciled thereunto. Having alſo made an Enquiry into the Ancient forms of Devotion, relating to the Euchariſt, remaining ſtill in this Church, and found them to ſpeak a Language, which has a Sence agreeing indeed with that of the Ancients, but no Sence at all, when the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is ſuppoſed, and thoſe Prayers to be interpreted by it, *&c.*

I ſhall now, for a Concluſion, take a view alſo of the principal Enemies of the Chriſtian Faith; which will afford a convincing Evidence, that the Roman Doctrine is Novel, and a ſtranger to the Ancient Chriſtians.

It is ſufficiently known, that the Adverſaries of Chriſtianity took all the occaſions poſſible, and whatſoever gave them any colour to reproach the *Faith* and *Worſhip* of Chriſtians, and to make their Names odious. Nothing that looked ſtrange and abſurd in either, eſcaped, being taken notice of by ſuch as *Celſus* and *Porphyry*, *Lucian* and *Julian*, among the Heathens,

Heathens, and such as *Trypho* among the Jews. They curiously examined and surveyed what they taught and practised, and whatsoever they thought to be foolish and incredible, they, with all their wit and cunning, endeavoured to expose it. So, they did with the Doctrines of the *Trinity*, *the Eternal Generation of the Son of God*, his *Incarnation*, his *Crucifixion* especially, and *our Resurrection*. Neither were they less prying into the Christian *Mysteries* and *Worship*, which they could not be ignorant of, there being so many Deserters and Apostates in those Times of Persecution, who were well acquainted with them; and by threatnings and fear of torment if there were any thing secret were likely to betray them. Not to insist upon this, that the great Traducer of Christians, I mean *Julian*, was himself once initiated in their Mysteries, and so could not be Ignorant of what any of them were; and has in particular laught at their Baptism, that Christians should fansy a purgation thereby from Great Crimes.

Yet, after all this, they took no occasion from the Eucharist to traduce them; tho, if Christians then had given that adoration to it, that is now paid in the Roman Church, and if they had declared, either for a *Corporal Presence*, or an *oral Manducation* of him that was their God, they had the fruitfullest Subject in the World given them, both to turn off all the Objections of the Christians against themselves, for worshipping senseless and inanimate things; and also to lay the most plausible Charge of folly and madness against them, which their great *Orator* * had pronounced, before Christianity was a Religion in the World. *Can any Man be supposed so mad, to believe that to be a God which he eats?*

* *Cicero, l. 3. de Nat. Deorum.* Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?

A Learned Romanist † affirms, of the Ancient Christians, *That they did testify their eating the Flesh, and drinking the Blood of their Lord God in their Discourses of the Eucharist.* Which is true indeed, taking this eating and drinking in the Sacramental Sence we do; and so their Adversaries must needs understand their meaning. Otherwise (without a Miracle to hinder it) what he acknowledges in the same place, could never

† *Rigaltius notis ad Tertul. lib. 2. c. 5. ad Uxorem.* Se id facere in Eucharisticis suis testarentur.

never be true, (*a*) *That among ſo many Reproaches of thoſe that accuſed Chriſtians of Impiety, for not having Altars nor Sacrifices, and among ſo many falſe Brethren that were Turn-coats, yet there were none that made this an Accuſation againſt them, that they ate the Fleſh of their God and Lord, and drank his Blood.*

(*a*) *Ibid.* Obſervandum vero, inter tot probra & convitia accuſantium Chriſtianos impietatis, eò quod neq; aras haberent neq; ſacrificarent, interq; tot fratrum perfidorum transfugia, non extitiſſe qui Chriſtianos criminarentur, quod Dei ac Domini ſui carnes ederent, ſanguinem potarent.

We have this ingenuous confeſſion of *Bellarmine* himſelf (*), *That we might be accounted truly Fools, if without the Word of God, we believed the true Fleſh of Chriſt to be eaten with the Mouth of our Bodies.* But whether *with* or *without* the Word of God they believed ſuch a corporal eating of Chriſt's Fleſh, had been all one to the Heathens, if they knew that this was their Belief, and it would rather have ſtrengthned their Reproach, if they knew that they were bound thus to believe. But then what he adds is very remarkable, *That Infidels always counted this a moſt fooliſh Paradox, as appears from* Averroes *and others.* I believe indeed, that they muſt always count this a fooliſh Paradox, which *Averroes* charged Chriſtians withal, in that known Saying of his (*b*). *That he found no Sect worſe, or more fooliſh, than the Chriſtians, who tear with their Teeth, and devour that God whom they worſhip.* But why was not this caſt always in the Teeth of Chriſtians, if this was always their profeſſed Doctrine? Was *Celſus*, or *Julian*, or *Lucian*, leſs ſagacious, or leſs malicious than *Averroes*, that not a word of this *fooliſh Paradox* was ever ſo much as hinted by them to the reproach of Chriſtians then?

(*) *De Euchariſt. l.* 2. *c.* 12. Vere ſtulti haberi poſſemus, ſi abſq; Verbo Dei crederemus veram Chriſti carnem ore corporali manducari.

Nam id ſemper infideles ſtultiſſimum paradoxum æſtimârunt, ut notum eſt de *Averroe* & aliis.

(*b*) Se Sectam Chriſtianâ deteriorem aut ineptiorem nullam reperire, quam qui ſequuntur, ii quem colunt Deum dentibus ipſi ſuis diſcerpunt ac devorant.

But the *Cardinal* has inſtanced the moſt unluckily in the World, in naming only *Averroes* for this Calumny, when all acknowledg that this *Philoſopher*, & P. *Innocent* 3. (who eſtabliſh'd *Tranſubſtantiation*) lived in the ſame Age; and ſome very learned Men prove, from the *Arabian* Accounts, that thoſe two were *Contemporaries*. And as for his [*& aliis*] *others*, I ſhould be glad

to ſee any named, that urged what *Averroes* did to the Chriſtians reproach, before the days of *Berengarius*.

After that indeed, we can meet with a Follower of *Mahomet*; who (as a Learned Man (c) gives us his words) ſays thus, *Thoſe words of Chriſt*, He that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, he is in me, and I in him, *&c. Chriſtians underſtand them literally, and ſo Chriſtians are more cruel againſt Chriſt, than Jews; for they left Chriſt when they had ſlain him, but theſe eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood, which as experience teſtifies, is more ſavage.*

(c) *Hottinger* in *Euchariſtia ejusq. Sacr.* 14. *p.* 220. *Abuzaid ben Edris* ita ſcribit, verba autem *Iſa* (ſic Arabes Chriſtum vocant) ſuper quo pax, *Qui edit carnem meam & bibit ſanguinem*, &c. Chriſtiani literaliter intelligunt. Atq; ſic Chriſtiani atrociores ſunt in Chriſtum quàm Judæi. Illi enim Chriſtum occiſum reliquerunt; hi carnem ejus edunt & ſanguinem bibunt, quod ipſo teſte experientia, truculentius eſt.

After the Roman Church's declaring for Tranſubſtantiation, (though not before) we meet with the Oppoſitions of *Jews*, teſtifying their abhorrency (d) of a Doctrine, which talks of a Sacrifice, and *makes Bread to be the Body of their God*, (which he means in the ſence of Tranſubſtantiation, by being turned into it, and cloathed with its Accidents) *whoſe Body that is in Heaven, comes upon the Altar; and upon the pronouncing theſe words*, For this is my Body, *by the Prieſt, whether good or wicked is all one, all things are made one Body with the Body of the Meſſias*, &c. *——Which things are all repugnant to the firſt Principles of Reaſon, and to our very Senſes themſelves.* As he afterwards ſhows in ſeveral Inſtances.

(d) *Ibid. Joſeph. Albo de Ikkarim, lib.* 3. *cap.* 25. Nam panis eſt corpus Dei ipſorum. Aiunt enim corpus Jeſu quod eſt in Cœlis, venire in Altare & veſtiri pane & vino, poſt pronunciata verba, *Hoc enim eſt Corpus meum*, à ſacrificulo, qualiſcunque ille demum fuerit, ſive pius ſive impius, & omnia fieri Corpus unum cum corpore Meſſiæ, &c. ——Repugnant hic omnia Intelligibilibus primis, & ipſis etiam ſenſibus.

And now we are told that it is a *common Bye-word* to reproach a Chriſtian by among the Turks, to call him *Mange Dieu*.

All theſe took their riſe plainly from *Tranſubſtantiation*, and not from the *Faith of the Ancient Church*: For if *one* of it (e) may ſpeak for the reſt, the *Old Chriſtians* agreed in the Abhorrence, and called it, *the extreameſt ſtupidity to worſhip that which is eaten.*

(e) *Theodoret. Interrog.* 55. *in Geneſ.* Ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἐσθίειν τὸ προσκυνεῖν τὸ ἐδώδιμον.

And

And again;

How can any one of a ſound Mind, call that a God, which being offered to the True God, is afterwards eaten by him?

Id. qu. 11. *in Levit.*
Πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις σωφρονῶν—ὀνομάσοι θεὸν—τὸ τῷ ἀληθινῷ θεῷ προσφερόμενον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ καταναλισκόμενον;

But now, after all, the ſaddeſt Conſideration is, that the Prejudices are ſo great againſt this, (and another *Twin-Doctrine* of the Roman Church, about the *worſhip of Images*) that a perpetual Stumbling-block ſeems to be laid before the Jews; and it may be look'd upon as the τὸ κατέχον, that which *will* always *hinder* and obſtruct their Converſion, whilſt it is believed by them to be the common Sence and Faith of Chriſtians; and they have too great a Temptation to believe ſo, when they have ſeen this Church, which has got the moſt worldly Power into its hands, perſecuting not only *Jews*, but *Hereticks* (as they call all other Chriſtians that deny this Doctrine) to the Death for gainſaying it; and when that Work will ceaſe, God only knows. The Jews can never be ſuppoſed to get over this hard Chapter, whilſt they who call themſelves the only Catholick Chriſtians, hold ſuch things about the *Body of Chriſt*, (and remember that it is about a Body) which as the forenamed *Joſ. Albo* (*f*) ſpeaks, *No Man's Mind can conceive, nor Tongue utter, nor any Ear can hear.* He means, by reaſon of their abſurdity.

(*f*) *Ibid.* Iſta talia ſunt quæ mens non poteſt concipere, neq; os eloqui, neq; auris audire.

So that the Caſe of the Jews, and their Converſion, ſeems to be hopeleſs and deſperate, according to all humane gueſſes, till there be a change wrought (not in the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine this Church dreams of, but) in the *Romaniſt's Belief.* And though this alſo may ſeem, upon many accounts, to be as hopeleſs as the former, yet, for a Concluſion, I will try, whether, as once the Great Apoſtle thought it a wiſe method (*Rom.* 11. 14.) by the Example of the Gentiles, παραζηλῶσαι, to provoke the Jews to *Emulation*; ſo it may not be as proper, to propoſe the Example of the *Jews themſelves* to the *Romaniſts*, to provoke their Emulation, whom they may ſee better explaining (as blind as they are) Chriſt's

words of Inſtitution; and agreeing better with the Ancient Church in the matter of the Euchariſt, than themſelves; and raiſing ſuch Arguments and Objections againſt the Tranſubſtantiating Doctrine, as can never, to any purpoſe, be anſwered.

The Inſtances of this are very remarkable, in a Book called *Fortalitium Fidei contra Judæos*, &c. printed *An.* 1494. but written, as the Author himſelf tells us *(fol. 61.)* in the Year 1458. where he gives us the Arguments of a Jew againſt Tranſubſtantiation; ſome of which I ſhall out of him faithfully tranſlate.

(g) *Vid. l.* 3. *conſid.* 6 *fol.* 130 *impoſſibl.* 10.

The Jew *(g)* begins with Chriſt's words of Inſtitution, and ſhows, that they cannot be interpreted otherwiſe than figuratively, and ſignificatively, as the Fathers, we have heard, have aſſerted.

"1. Vos Chriſtiani dicitis, *&c.* Ye Chriſtians ſay in that "Sacrament *(of the Euchariſt)* there is really the Body and "Blood of Chriſt. This is impoſſible. Becauſe when your "Chriſt, ſhowing the Bread, ſaid, *This is my Body*, he ſpake "*ſignificatively*, and not *really*; as if he had ſaid, this is the "Sign or Figure of my Body. After which way of ſpea-"king, *Paul* ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 10. *The Rock was Chriſt*; that is, "a Figure of Chriſt. And it appears evidently, that this "was the Intention of your Chriſt, becauſe when he had diſ-"courſed about the eating his Body, and drinking his Blood, "to lay the offence that roſe upon it among the Diſciples, he "ſays, as it were, expounding himſelf, *The words that I have "ſpoken to you are Spirit and Life:* denoting, that what he "had ſaid, was to be underſtood, not according to the Let-"ter, but according to the Spiritual Sence. And when Chriſt "ſaid, *This is my Body*, holding Bread in his Hands, he "meant, that that Bread was his Body *(in potentia propin-"qua)* in a near poſſibility, *viz.* after he had eaten it, for "then it would be turned into his Body, or into his Fleſh; "and ſo likewiſe the Wine. And after this manner we Jews "do, on the day of Unleavened Bread; for we take unlea-"vened Bread in memory of that time, when our Fathers "were brought out of the Land of *Egypt*, and were not per-

"mitted

" mitted to ſtay ſo long there, as whilſt the Bread might be " leavened, that was the Bread of the Paſſover; and we ſay, " *This is the Bread which our Fathers ate*, though that be not " preſent, ſince it is paſt and gone; and ſo this unleavened " Bread, minds us of the Bread of *Egypt*, and *this Bread* is " not *that*; ſo is that Bread of which the Sacrifice of the Al- " tar is made. It is ſufficient for Chriſtians to ſay, that it is " in memory of that Bread of Chriſt, though *this Bread* be " not *that*. And becauſe it was impoſſible that one Bit of his " Fleſh ſhould be preſerved in memory of him, he command- " ed, that that Bread ſhould be made, and that Wine, which " was his Fleſh and Blood in the next remove to come into " act; as we Jews do, (*and Chriſt borrowed his Phraſes and* " *the Elements from their Supper*) at the Paſſover with the un- " leavened Bread, as we ſaid before. When therefore your " Chriſt at the Table took Bread, and the Cup, and gave " them to his Diſciples, he did not bid them believe that the " Bread and Wine were turned into his Body and Blood, but " that as often as they did that, they ſhould do it in remem- " brance of him, *viz.* in memory of that paſt Bread: and " if you Chriſtians did underſtand it ſo, no impoſſibility " would follow; but to ſay the contrary, as you aſſert, is " to ſay an impoſſible thing, and againſt the intention of your " Chriſt, as we have ſhow'd.

This is what the Jew urges with great reaſon. But the Catholick Author makes a poor Anſwer to it, and has nothing to ſay, in effect, but this, *That the Tradition of the Catholick Church concerning this Sacrament is true.* viz. *That in this Sacrament there is really, and not by way of Signification, the True Body and True Blood of Chriſt.*

2. Whereas the Roman Church flies to Miracles in this caſe of Tranſubſtantiation, the Jew encounters that next of all, thus.

" You Chriſtians ſay that the Body and Blood of Chriſt " is in the Sacrament of the Altar by a Miracle; this I prove " to be impoſſible. Becauſe if there were any Miracle in the " caſe, it would appear to the Eye; as when *Moſes* turned " the Rod into a Serpent; that was performed evidently to the *Ibid.* 11. *Impoſſib. p.* 131.

"the Eye, though Men knew not how it was done. So also "in the case of the Ark of the Covenant of Old, mighty "Miracles were wrought; and those not only sensible Mira- "cles, but also publick, and apparent to all the People; (in- "somuch that Infidels were terrified at the very report of "such Miracles) Men seeing before their Eyes the Divine "Power brightly shining in Reverence of the Ark of his "Covenant, as appears in his Dividing the Waters of *Jor-* "*dan*, while the People of *Israel* passed over dry-shod, the "Waters on one side swelling like a Mountain, and on the "other flowing down as far as the dead Sea, till the Priests "with the Ark went over the Chanel of *Jordan*, and then "*Jordan* returned to its wonted course. But the Kings of "the *Amorites* and *Canaanites* hearing of so great and pub- "lick a Miracle, were so confounded with the terror of "God, that no Spirit remained in them (*Josu.* c. 4. & 5.) "and so I might instance in many other Evident Miracles, "which to avoid tediousness, I omit. And yet in that Ark, "neither God nor Christ was really contained, but only the "Tables of Stone containing the Precepts of the Decalogue, "and the Pot of Manna, *&c.* (*Exod.* 16.) and the Rod of "*Aaron* that flourished in the House of *Levi* (*Numb.* 17.) If "therefore by the Ark (that carried only the foresaid Bo- "dies that were inanimate, how sacred soever they were) "God wrought in Honour of it such evident far-spreading "and publick Miracles, how much more powerfully should "they have been wrought by him, if it were true, that in "your Sacrament of the Altar the true God or Christ were "really contained, whom you affirm that he ought to be wor- "shipped and venerated infinitely above all. Since therefore "no such thing do's appear there to the Eye, it follows that "it is impossible for any Miracle to be done there, since this "is against the Nature of a Miracle.

The answer to this is so weak, and so the rest, are gene- rally such an unintelligible School-jargon, that I shall not tire the Reader with them. But shall go on with the Jew.

Ibid. 12. *Im- possib. fol.* 132.

3. "You Christians do assert, that the true Body of Christ "begins to be on the Altar. This seems to be impossible;

"For

"For a thing begins to be where it was not before, two ways. "Either by Local Motion, or by the conversion of another "thing into it; as appears in Fire, which begins to be any "where, either because it is kindled there anew, or is "brought thither *de novo*.

"But it is manifest, that the true Body of Christ was not "always on the Altar; because the Christians assert, that "Christ ascended in his Body to Heaven. It seems also im-"possible to be said, that any thing here is converted anew "into Christ's Body; because nothing seems convertible into "that which existed before; since that into which another "thing is turned, by such a change, begins to exist. Now "it is manifest, that Christ's Body did præexist, seeing it "was conceived in the Womb of *Mary*. It seems therefore "impossible, that it should begin to be on the Altar anew, by "the Conversion of another thing into it.

"In like manner, neither by a change of Place, because "every thing that is locally moved, do's so begin to be in one "place, that it ceases to be in that other in which it was be-"fore. We must therefore say, that when Christ begins to "be on this Altar on which the Sacrament is perform'd, he "ceases to be in Heaven whither he ascended. It is also "plain, that this Sacrament is in like manner celebrated on "divers Altars. Therefore it is impossible that the Body of "Christ should begin to be there by a Local Motion.

4. "You Christians affirm, that your Christ is whole in "the Sacrament, under the Species of Bread and Wine. "This I prove thus to be impossible. Because never are the "Parts of any Body contained in divers Places, the Body it "self remaining whole. But now it is manifest, that in this "Sacrament the Bread and Wine are asunder in separate Pla-"ces. If therefore the Flesh of Christ be under the Species "of Bread, and his Blood under the Species of Wine, it "seems to follow, that Christ do's not remain whole, but "that always when this Sacrament is celebrated, his Blood is "separated from his Body. *Ibid.* 13. *Impos. fol.* 134.

5. "You

Ibid. 14. *Impoſſ. fol.* 102.

5. "You Chriſtians ſay, that in that little Hoſt, the Body "of Chriſt is contained. This I prove to be impoſſible. Be- "cauſe it is impoſſible that a greater Body ſhould be included "in the place of a leſſer Body. But it is manifeſt, that the "True Body of Chriſt is of a greater Quantity than the "Bread that is offered on the Altar. Therefore it ſeems im- "poſſible, that the true Body of Chriſt ſhould be whole and "entire there, where the Bread ſeems to be. But if the "whole be not there, but only ſome part of it, then the fore- "ſaid Inconvenience returns, that always when this Sacra- "ment is perform'd, the Body of Chriſt is Differenced (or "*ſeparated*) by Parts.

I will only here ſet down what the Catholick Author replies to this (after the unintelligible diſtinctions of the Schools) and ſeems moſt to truſt to, even ſuch wiſe Similitudes as theſe, that the Soul is greater than the Body, and yet is contained within it; that a great Mountain is contained in the little Apple of the Eye; and the greateſt Bodies in a little Looking-glaſs, and great Virtues in little precious Stones, and in the Little Body of the Pope great Authority, &c.

Ibid. 15. *Impoſſ. fol.* 135.

6. "The Jew ſays, you Chriſtians affirm that your Chriſt "is in like manner on more Altars where Maſſes are celebra- "ted. This ſeems to be impoſſible, becauſe it is impoſſible "for one Body to exiſt in more places than one. But it is "plain that this Sacrament is celebrated in more Places. "Therefore it ſeems impoſſible that the Body of Chriſt ſhould "be truly contained in this Sacrament. Unleſs perhaps any "ſhould ſay, that according to one part of it, it is here, and "according to another Part elſewhere. But from thence it "would again follow, that by the Celebration of this Sacra- "ment the Body of Chriſt is divided into Parts; when yet "the Quantity of the Body of Chriſt ſeems not to ſuffice for "the dividing ſo many Particles out of it, as there are Pla- "ces in which this Sacrament is performed.

7. "You

7. "You Chriſtians ſay, that after Conſecration, all the "Accidents of Bread and Wine are manifeſtly perceived in "this Sacrament, *viz.* the Colour, Taſt, Smell, Figure, "Quantity and Weight. About which you cannot be de- "ceived, becauſe Senſe is not deceived about its proper Ob- "jects. Now theſe Accidents, as you aſſert, cannot be in "the Body of Chriſt as in their Subject. —— Nor can they "ſubſiſt by themſelves, ſeeing the Nature and Eſſence of an "Accident is to be in another thing (7. *Metaphyſ.*) For Ac- "cidents ſeeing they are Forms, cannot be individuated but "by their Subject; and if the Subject were taken away, "would be univerſal Forms. It remains therefore that theſe "Accidents are in their determinate Subjects, *viz.* In the "ſubſtance of Bread and Wine. Wherefore there is there "the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, and not the ſubſtance "of Chriſt's Body; for it ſeems impoſſible that two Bodies "ſhould be together, *(in one place.)* *Ibid.* 16. *Impoſſ.* *fol.* 136.

8. "The Jews ſay, It is certain that if that Wine in your "Sacrament were taken in great Quantity, that it would heat "*(the Body)* and intoxicate, as before it was a Sacrament: "and alſo that the Bread would ſtrengthen and nouriſh. It "ſeems alſo, that if it be kept long and careleſly, it will cor- "rupt; and it may be eaten of Mice; the Bread and Wine "alſo may be burnt and turned into Vapours; all which can- "not agree to the Body of Chriſt, ſeeing your Faith declares "it to be impaſſible. It ſeems therefore impoſſible, that the "Body of Chriſt ſhould be contained ſubſtantially in this Sa- "crament. *Ibid.* 17. *Impoſſ.* *fol.* 137.

9. "The Jew ſays, That you Chriſtians break that Sacra- "ment into Parts; Therefore it is impoſſible that the Body "of Chriſt ſhould be there. The Conſequence is thus pro- "ved: Becauſe, that Fraction which do's ſenſibly appear, "cannot be without a Subject. For it ſeems to be abſurd "to ſay, That the Subject of this Fraction is Chriſt's Body. "Therefore it is impoſſible Chriſt's Body ſhould be there, but "only the Subſtance of Bread and Wine. *Ibid.* 18. *Impoſſ.* *fol.* 137.

There is a great deal more of what the Jews ſay againſt this Doctrine, in that Author: but this is enough, for the purpoſes I before mentioned (and ſo I leave it to the Conſciences of thoſe concerned) to ſhow, that even the Jews have better explained the words whereby Chriſt inſtituted this Sacrament, than the Romaniſts have, by making it a Figure of Chriſt's Body, and not the Body it ſelf, ſpoken more agreeably to the Faith of the *Ancient Church*, that did ſo; and have confuted the Errors of *this Church*, by Maximes conſonant to the Senſe and Reaſon of all Man-kind. Which God grant they may be ſenſible of, who have ſo manifeſtly ſwerved from them all, that ſo *their Words* may never riſe up in Judgment againſt them.

THE END.

Books lately printed for Richard Chiſwell.

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D.D. *4o.*

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Biſhop of *Sarisbury*: Made Engliſh by a Perſon of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the ſaid Biſhop: Collected and written by the ſame Hand. *Octavo.*

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddiſworth* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Sevil*) in Matters of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. *Octavo.*

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *Caſuiſts*. *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.* Firſt and Second Parts.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]. *Quarto.*

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, in the ſeveral Articles. propoſed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM* [in his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*]. *Quarto.*

A Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; againſt the Exceptions of Monſieur de *Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. *4o.*

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practice of the *Church of Rome*. With an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. *8o.*

A Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented, being an Anſwer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM* truly repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Chriſtian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man's* Reply to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. *4o.*

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith, an the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Anſwer to THREE APERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholick Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*